

THE CLERGY REVIEW

ST. DENYS THE GREAT

BY THE REV. J. P. ARENDZEN, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

HUMAN nature finds it hard to submit to authority, in consequence the history of the exercise of authority, as far as it exists in ancient records, consists to a large extent in a list of acts of resistance and rebellion. Such acts may be successful or unsuccessful, complete or incomplete, or perhaps only manifestations of resentment and irritation. As long as humility and submission are difficult virtues and as long as men retain their free will and a craving for independence, it will be so. The normal exercise of authority followed by proper obedience does not rouse many chroniclers. It is the tale of the power resisted, or of the resistance overcome which stimulates the pen of the historian. Those who, after a struggle, finally submit to the ruling of their superiors, are not anxious to retain documents, which are records of their own mistakes or failings and remind them of their own defeat and humiliation. Even rulers themselves who wish to maintain the good name of the community which they govern and avoid the appearance of unseemly quarrels, or rulers who look upon too great freedom of speech in their inferiors as infringements of their dignity, are not often willing to preserve documents detrimental to their own position.

All this applies to the supreme authority in the Christian Church: the Papacy. It is true especially of the first centuries of the Christian era. Under the pressure of the hostile Roman Empire and in the times of persecution, the exercise of Papal authority was necessarily intermittent; both rulers and ruled had every interest in hiding from the outside Pagan world all records of unseemly dissensions within the Christian body. History records only a few acts of Papal

ruling exercised during the first two centuries after the Apostles, and these acts reveal great bitterness amongst the dissentients within the Christian body, such bitterness in fact as is common, not between equals, but from inferiors towards superiors. Two of these acts deal with mere disciplinary matters, and two with matters doctrinal. The disciplinary matters were the irregularities in the Church of Corinth, settled by Pope Clement about the year A.D. 96, and the correct date of keeping Easter, which called for the interference of Pope Victor in A.D. 146. Matters of doctrine were the validity of heretical baptism, when Pope Stephen forbade the innovation of re-baptizing heretics, and the unrestricted power of the Church to absolve from all sins even the greatest, when the decree of Pope Callixtus was derided as "an utterance of a High Pontiff" by the Montanist Tertullian in A.D. 210.

These are cases of authority meeting more or less spectacular resistance and therefore recorded by the historians. But a happy chance has kept us some details of the normal working of Papal authority during the lifetime of Denys the Great, Patriarch of Alexandria, in the middle of the third century.

These it will be of interest to study for they give us an insight in the real practical value of Papal guidance in those early times.

St. Denys was deservedly called "Denys the Great" by after-generations, for he was indeed the dominating figure in the Church of his century, he was a real father of orthodoxy and a canonical writer, a "classical writer" as we would say, and as St. Basil the Great calls him.

He was born about A.D. 200, or possibly a little earlier, since we know that in A.D. 264 he was accounted a very old man. He clearly belonged to a very well-to-do family, perhaps even one of rank, but his parents were pagan. His conversion was due, as he himself states, to his extensive reading. He tells us in a letter that he had read a great deal of heretical literature with the honest purpose of using his knowledge in defence of the truth. When, however, a fellow priest raised objections, afraid lest he should contaminate his mind thereby, Denys felt qualms of conscience. He was only reassured by a vision telling him that he might read what he liked, for this

freedom in reading had originally been the very cause of his conversion. He attended the lectures of Origen and kept up correspondence with his celebrated teacher even in later years, at least as long as he was a priest. Origen was at least ten years older than his disciple, and died in the early years of Denys' episcopate under the tortures sustained in the Decian persecution. Origen had been driven from Alexandria about A.D. 230, and been succeeded by Heraclas as head of the Catechetical School. Heraclas remained Dean of this first Christian Theological Faculty only two years, after which he became bishop. Denys succeeded him as head of the school which he ruled for fifteen years. During this time he became a priest, though he had at some time been married, and his sons lived with him apparently in his episcopal residence in later years. After the death of Heraclas he succeeded him as Bishop of Alexandria.

His were stirring times. It is quite true that the Church abroad enjoyed comparative tranquillity. During the reign of the Emperor Philip the Arab (A.D. 244-249), the powers that were seemed even to smile upon the Church. The cultured and learned had flocked to the Catechetical School. Origen himself had been invited by a Roman General in Arabia to instruct him; the Empress Mamaea called Origen to Antioch for a discussion on religion. The Emperor himself was rumoured to have leanings towards Christianity. Yet St. Denys' own episcopate, which lasted almost twenty years, was full of trouble, almost every calamity befell him and his people. In the reign of Philip, a pagan prophet roused the heathen population of Alexandria against the Christians and kept them all in terror. Old and young, men and women, were tortured by the frantic mob, their houses were plundered, their furniture smashed and burnt, till the city looked as if it had sustained a siege. When this storm was barely over there came the Civil War with its street fighting and innumerable horrors. When this was passed came the fury of the Decian persecution. Soldiers were sent to capture the bishop. St. Denys remained for four days in his house awaiting arrest. The police took it for granted that the Christian bishop would not be so foolhardy as to stay in his own home, hence they explored the whole city but could not find him. On the fourth

day St. Denys and his household left the city, but the police, after some hours, succeeded in capturing him and some of his clergy. Brought back under escort to Alexandria, he spent the night in a village called Taposiris. Meanwhile, his son Timothy, who was not with him when he was arrested, returned and found the house empty. On learning what had happened, he fled and to a peasant expressed his grief. This peasant was just going to a wedding, he ran and told the party. The men of this party, in great anger and in anxiety for their bishop, rushed to Taposiris. The centurion and the police became afraid of the crowd, released their charge and took to their heels. St. Denys himself, who was in bed when the rescue party reached him, thought them a set of robbers and offered them his clothes by the side of his bed till he realized that they had come to save him. Then he changed his tone, he was indignant that they had robbed him of the hope of a martyr's crown, but the delighted peasants took their bishop in his nightgown and carried him into safety. Thus he found a refuge somewhere in an obscure village in Libya, and from there administered his church.

After a while, because he administered his diocese from a hiding-place, people accused him of cowardice in having fled. He had to write and defend himself.

After the Decian persecution came heretical and schismatical troubles. Some six years later came the Valerian persecution, which burnt most fiercely at Alexandria. St. Denys was brought before the imperial Vicar, Aemilian, and confessed his faith. He was exiled to Kephro in Libya. He used his exile as an opportunity to spread the faith amongst the surrounding tribes. He was then exiled further still into Libya at a place called Kollythion. Though the place was dangerous and purely pagan, Alexandrian Christians found their way thither. In March, 262, the edict of Gallienus enabled St. Denys to return to his see, but civil war, famine and pestilence awaited him in the capital of Egypt. He was called to the Synod at Antioch, which was to condemn Paul of Samosata, but he excused himself on account of his great age and infirmities and died about A.D. 264.

St. Denys was, above all, a shepherd of his flock, a bishop and a pastor of his people in difficult times. He was a man of peace. In his dealings with his fellow men

he showed such sweet reasonableness as made one realize that the meek shall possess the earth. He earned the title of "the Great" by twenty years of unremitting, unselfish activity. He was a man of literary attainments and of wide reading, but not a great speculative thinker. He had the erudition but not the acumen of a great theologian. In the three great questions of the day: the reconciliation of apostates, the baptism of heretics and the refutation of Sabellianism, he did not see as clear as some of his contemporaries, but he followed Rome. Rome was the first see of Christendom, Alexandria was second and subordinate. The question of the validity of heretical baptism puzzled him much. He was impressed by the opposition of St. Cyprian, by the synods of Iconium and Synnada, he pleaded with the Pope to go warily and not to do anything hastily, yet evidently he himself followed Rome in his own practice. It is his relation to Rome which interests us most.

St. Denys was a great letter writer. We know of scores of his letters, but, alas, only fragments of a few are still extant.

First, there are his letters regarding the Novatian schism. An anti-pope, with the name of Novatian, had arisen in Rome against the legitimate Pope Saint Cornelius (251-253). The Schism was caused by dissatisfaction at the mercy shown by the Pope towards sinners. The Decian persecution had caused many apostasies. Not all Christians had proved to be of the stuff of which martyrs are made. Under fear of torture and death many had yielded. They had sacrificed to the gods or, at least, they had compromised and accepted certificates of idolatry, which kindly magistrates granted even to some who had not actually sacrificed. After a short time these weak souls had realized their crime and begged re-admission into the Church. The Pope was inclined to be lenient. There arose a rigorist party which felt shocked at this laxity. Excommunication for life, so they held, was but a slight penalty for such a crime as apostasy. The Puritan party elected Novatian as anti-pope. This unfortunate priest had become Pope Cornelius' personal enemy. After the martyrdom of Pope St. Fabian, a papal election had been impossible for fifteen months owing to the fierceness of persecution.

Novatian had been what in modern terms we might call Vicar Capitular, that is, the leader of the fifty-three priests of Rome, who had to administer the diocese till the election of the new bishop. Novatian was undoubtedly the most gifted Roman priest of the time, a man of remarkable attainments in philosophy and literature. He expected to be the new Pope. Instead of him they elected a much simpler and humbler individual, St. Cornelius. This was too much for Novatian. He formed a puritan party, had himself elected and inveigled three country bishops to come and consecrate him. Thus he began a schism which spread throughout the Church. A disputed election of a merely local bishop would have affected only a limited district, but it was Rome and of necessity affected the whole Church. The schism continued, or at least eked out a miserable existence, for almost four hundred years. Novatian wrote to St. Denys to announce his so-called election to the Papacy. We still have St. Denys' answer. It is so characteristic that we shall give it in full :

" If you were against your will—as you say—forced into it [Novatian pretended to have accepted his election reluctantly], prove this by a resignation of your own free will. You should rather have suffered anything than cause division in the Church of God. Martyrdom in order to prevent schism would have been not less glorious than martyrdom for the refusal to sacrifice to the gods, nay, I think, it would have been more glorious. For, in the latter case, one becomes a martyr only for one's own sake, in the former for the sake of the whole Church. And even still, if you persuade and compel the brethren to return to unity, your merits will be greater than your previous fault. This will not be counted against you, the other will be praised! But if this is beyond your power, if the brethren should remain disobedient, then save, save at least your own soul! "

St. Denys realized the fearful evil done by dissension in the centre of Christendom and by a fierce Jansenistic spirit which wrought disaster fourteen hundred years before it played havoc in the Church of France. He wrote a number of letters to vindicate the Pope's policy of leniency towards unfortunate lapsed Christians. He wrote to the patriarch Fabius of Antioch, who seemed to approve of extreme rigorism. He wrote an encyclical

to his own Egyptian patriarchate about the same matter. He wrote to Conon, Bishop of Hermapolis. He wrote a pastoral to his own beloved and much-tried Alexandrians. He wrote to Origen, whose influence counted for much; he wrote to Mezuzanes, Bishop of the Armenians; to Thelymius, Bishop of Laodicea, a prominent see in Asia Minor. He wrote to Pope Cornelius, who had written to him about the Novatian troubles. We know of five more letters to Christian confessors at Rome. They had valiantly confessed the faith in danger of martyrdom, but they had afterwards sided with Novatian. St. Denys wrote them two more letters, when they had happily returned to the unity of the Church. St. Denys' influence throughout Christendom must have been immense and a solid ground for his title "the Great."

Another fierce subject of controversy in those days was the re-baptism of those baptized by heretics. The ancient practice—as all had to own—was not to re-baptize, but only to administer the Sacrament of Penance. However, in Africa, under the Primate Agrippinus, the law was introduced to re-baptize heretics. In A.D. 230 two councils were held in Asia Minor approving of re-baptism. In A.D. 250 the Pope intervened, strictly forbidding re-baptism and telling all to cling to the ancient custom. St. Cyprian in Africa and Firmilian in Asia Minor sharply retorted that a custom might be wrong, and one ought to go not by custom but by right reason. In any case, they pleaded, it was only a matter of discipline. Each particular church should follow its own ways in matters the convenience of which they could judge of best. The Pope was much more far-sighted. It was not merely a question of discipline but of principle and of doctrine. The very nature of baptism and the validity of the Sacraments was in question. About the ceremonial in receiving converts from heresy back into the Church, each bishop might legislate as he liked, but this was not a question of fitness, convenience or ceremonial, it was much more. The matter was, of course, complicated, some Gnostic baptisms were really invalid because they used oil or wine instead of water, or changed the baptismal formula or had no intention of conferring a genuine Christian rite, but this was not the case with the majority of heretics. Pope St. Stephen threatened to excommunicate the bishops of Asia Minor unless they

obeyed. Firmilian of Cæsarea wrote bitter and insolent things against him, for vaunting himself about holding Peter's See while not behaving as a successor of St. Peter should. St. Cyprian in Africa stiffened Firmilian in his obstinacy. St. Augustine, more than a hundred years later, argued that somehow St. Cyprian must have repented of his errors since he was a saintly man and died a martyr.

Now St. Denys seems mainly to have endeavoured to mediate between the angry parties. He wrote "suppliant" letters exhorting to peace. Originally, he seems not to have realized the doctrinal importance of the point. He felt impressed by the two councils in Asia Minor which ordered re-baptism. Finally he saw matters as the Pope saw them. He acknowledged the baptism of Montanist heretics as valid. This we know for certain from St. Basil the Great, who succeeded Firmilian in his see after about a century. St. Denys in his own diocese evidently did not re-baptize and in these matters entirely abided by Rome. This becomes curiously plain from a set of letters from St. Denys to Rome about a scruple of conscience he had. There was a layman in his diocese who, many years after his conversion from heresy or Gnosticism, we do not know which, was tormented by doubts about his original baptism received outside the Church. It seemed to him in his later years to have been only some queer blasphemous ceremony and not true baptism. In consequence, in his old age, he stopped going to the Sacraments from sheer dread of profaning them, and he was perpetually troubling the bishop to re-baptize him, or rather to baptize him properly. The man had been regular at the Sacraments for many years and the bishop, having Rome's warning before him, dared not go through the rite of baptism and yet felt uneasy about refusing the bothersome old man. No less than six letters are known dealing with this matter, of which some to Pope Dionysius, some to Pope Sixtus II. A modern bishop of our own days would soon have settled the matter by giving conditional baptism and would hardly have troubled Rome about it. St. Denys must have had rather a timorous conscience in matters of obedience to Rome.

A third great trouble in that century was Sabellianism. This heresy denied the distinction of the three persons

in the Blessed Trinity. They held but one person in God. The Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost represented but different aspects, phases or modalities of the One Divine Personality; in fact, they were little more than mere names for the one God. This heresy had been condemned by two Popes, Zephyrinus and Callixtus, about the years A.D. 217 to 222. Sabellius was excommunicated at Rome, but the heresy had taken refuge and had spread in what is now the Italian colony of Tripoli to the West of Egypt in North Africa. It had soon after received unexpected support from Paul of Samosata. This man was a fabulously wealthy profiteer during the Great War of Rome with Persia. After the sack of Antioch he had succeeded, through the protection of Queen Zenobia of Palmyra, in becoming the Christian Bishop and Patriarch of Antioch. He not only adopted Sabellianism but even attacked the divinity of Our Lord, saying that Christ had only gradually become deified. Thrice condemned by a local council and deposed, Paul had defied the sentence, and, being Prime Minister of Queen Zenobia, in whose dominions Antioch was, had forcibly maintained himself in his see. The Roman Emperor, Aurelian, finally recaptured Antioch and, appealed to by the Christians, he decreed that all Church property should be restored to the Christians, who were in union with Rome and the bishops in Italy. Pagan though he was, Aurelian knew what was the proper authority in Christendom.

St. Denys spent much of the later years of his episcopate in combating Sabellianism. It had first entered the Five-Town District of Libya in A.D. 257, and roused fearful disturbances in the Christian world. All parties appealed to St. Denys in whose patriarchate the Pentapolis or the Five Towns were situated. They sent an embassy to him from the disturbed district. St. Denys at once condemned the new heresy as "full of blasphemy against Almighty God, the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, full of unbelief in His only-begotten Son, the First-Born of all creation, the Word incarnate, full of folly regarding the Holy Ghost."

In a number of letters or encyclicals he endeavoured to bring the heretics back to the truth. Copies of these letters he sent to Pope Sixtus II (257-258). Unfortunately in these letters, through excess of zeal to stamp out the

new heresy, St. Denys himself fell seemingly into the opposite error. He so emphasized the reality of the distinction between the divine persons in the Blessed Trinity that he almost made three gods of them, and he made the Son so different from the Father that he seemed to imply that the Son was a creature of the Father. He used phraseology which was at least very loose and equivocal in a letter to two bishops, Telesphorus and Euphranor. Now St. Athanasius, who ruled over the see of Alexandria a century later, will tell us what happened. "Some orthodox brethren of the Church went to Rome and denounced Denys to Pope Dionysius, the successor of Pope Xystus II. They told him that Denys taught that the Father was not always Father, but only became such through the birth of His Divine Son. He placed the Son in the category of creatures and denied the Father to be of the same being with the Son."

The Pope held a synod at Rome and wrote a dogmatic letter to Alexandria setting forth the true Christian doctrine concerning the Trinity. He did not directly mention St. Denys' name, but spoke in general against people who taught incorrectly. He accompanied, however, his official conciliar declaration with a private letter to St. Denys asking him to justify himself and explain his writings. The doctrinal letter to the Alexandrians is the earliest dogmatic Papal rescript at present extant, and will bear quotation in full as far as it bears on our point.

Having refuted Sabellianism the Pope turns to the opposite error: "Next I may reasonably turn to those who divide, and dissect and destroy that most sacred doctrine of the Church of God, the divine monarchy, making it as it were three powers, and parted subsistencies and godheads three. I am told that some among you, who are catechists and teachers of the divine word, are holding this opinion. They are diametrically opposed, so to speak, to the tenets of Sabellius, for he blasphemously says that the Son is the Father and the Father the Son. They, on the contrary, in some way preach three gods by dividing the holy Unity in three substances foreign to each other and utterly separate. For the Divine Word must needs be united to the God of all,

and the Holy Ghost must rest within and dwell within God. Thus into the One as into a summit, the God of all, I mean, must the Divine Trinity be gathered up and brought together. . . . Equally one must censure those who hold God the Son to be something created and who consider that the Lord has come into being as if He were one of the things that entered into existence, whereas Holy Writ witnesses to a generation and an origin proper to Him but not to any fashioning or making.

"It is, therefore, no ordinary but a supreme blasphemy to say that the Lord is in any way a handiwork, for if He began to be the Son, this would imply that He once was not, but He was always."

The Pope then goes on more at length to argue the point and especially to refute their misinterpretations of Scripture texts.

It is to be noted with care that the Pope is here directly addressing the faithful of another diocese over the head of their own bishop and that the bishop of the Second See in Christendom, who has been accused by his own faithful, who had come to Rome to complain of the hazardous expressions of their Ordinary. Moreover, the Pope added to his public doctrinal letter a private one calling upon the bishop to explain. St. Denys, so far from resenting this interference in his patriarchate, by his subsequent conduct acknowledged it to be legitimate. This can only be understood if we realize that St. Denys accepted the Pope as a superior doctrinal authority. We see, therefore, here an instance of the normal working of Papal supremacy in the third century.

St. Denys first excused and defended himself in a letter to the Pope, and afterwards in a longer treatise, likewise addressed to the Pope and called: *Refutation and Defence*. The second word of the Greek title is *Apologia*, and the contents of the treatise are described by Athanasius a score of times by the Greek verb, *apologeisthai*. This word, though not quite identical with our English terms, apology and to apologize, is most consonant with the idea of self-defence against accusations before a Superior.

St. Denys acknowledges that the words he had used in his letter to Euphranor had been unfortunate and somewhat unsuitable, but he claims that he had used

other terms also which made his meaning perfectly clear. He pleads that it was unfair to take words out of their context and that these people had rushed off to Rome before coming to him first and asking what he had meant by these expressions. St. Denys, then, in his treatise, or *Apologia*, explains his teaching about the Trinity, which is really orthodox. He seems, in fact, to have satisfied the Pope about the correctness of his faith.

As a matter of fact the passages which have come down to us of St. Denys' original letter, which caused the trouble, are clearly incorrect. It seems that St. Denys on being better instructed by the Pope really changed his mind and changed it for the better. St. Athanasius tries to shield the good name of St. Denys by saying that he wrote only half the truth because his addressees could not bear the full truth at the time, in arguing he deliberately did not go beyond the point immediately under discussion. But St. Athanasius is a little too preoccupied in saving the name of his saintly predecessor. St. Basil, who had no axe to grind, freely acknowledges that St. Denys had incorrect ideas but that he changed them. In his letter to Euphranor and Ammon, St. Denys had called God the Son, "something made, something which had come to be"—*poiema kai genetou*—a phrase, which no explanations can really justify. He had directly said that the Son "being a thing made (*poiema*) was not before He began to be." Again no explanations could really justify the use of such language and the Pope does well in condemning these very terms in the letter to the faithful of Alexandria, which was indirectly meant for their bishop. The plain fact is that being sharply called to account by his opponents and blamed by the Pope, he withdrew within the lines of orthodoxy and then persuaded himself that he had really always meant this. No doubt, he had an excuse; arguing with Sabellians he had, in the heat of the strife, overshot the mark.

Perhaps also St. Denys was misled by a quaint opinion of his former master Origen and of his school. They used to distinguish between the Word, the *Logos*, as immanent in God, the Word as in the bosom of the Father (*Logos Endiathetos*), and the Word as uttered, that is, manifested in creation (*Logos Prophorikos*), the

Word by whom all things were made, as we read in the opening of the Gospel of St. John.

This distinction is, as a matter of fact, very misleading, for it is a distinction without a difference; it is based on a misunderstanding, not only idle but dangerous. At the creation nothing whatever changed in regard to the relation of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity towards one another. When we say that God sent forth His wisdom in creating the world, we are in no sense referring to the eternal generation of the Son from the Father in the Trinity, but merely to the manifestation in time of that wisdom which is common to the divine nature. We appropriate creation to the Father, wisdom to the Son, sanctification and sanctity itself to the Holy Ghost, because these divine workings *ad extra* in some sense portray the distinction between the three divine Persons.

St. Denys, misled by an all too subtle speculation of the schools, may have thought of this Uttered Word or Manifested Wisdom in creation as something begun, something created, something that once was not, but happily on being challenged he withdrew to simple orthodox Church teaching, which knows only of the Word eternally in the Bosom of the Father. The Council of Antioch in St. Denys' lifetime had officially condemned the term "consubstantial" or *homoousios*, as it was then abused by the Sabellians, though less than a century later it was adopted by the Council of Nicea in A.D. 325 against the Arians. St. Denys' vagueness of thought in these high matters is not so very surprising. It needed a Pope to guard revealed truth against the frailty of the human mind. The exercise of Papal authority and the anxious obedience of the Bishop of the second see of Christendom secured unity of faith in the third century. Would to God that in later centuries the erring had been as submissive to the voice of Peter as St. Denys was.

CONTEMPLATIVE PRAYER

By * * *

II. THE PASSIVE NIGHT OF SENSE.

Omnem palmitem, qui fert fructum, purgabit eum, ut fructum plus afferat.

IN this and in a subsequent article my object is to present, in his own words, St. John's teaching on the first beginnings of contemplation and the first passive purifications which he calls the Night of Sense. It seemed better to divide his teaching thus, though many of the passages to be quoted deal with both subjects, because most of the discussions of to-day, reflected in spiritual books, deal with contemplative prayer by itself, while the passive purifications of sense are less thoroughly dealt with, outside the circle of those writers who derive straight from St. John. Any selection of extracts is naturally open to criticism, but some selection and comparison is essential, as those who know St. John well will agree. Though so apparently methodical, he has a way of giving some of his most important observations as *obiter dicta*, and a habit of repeating such observations in different contexts, so that only by comparing one with another can we arrive at a full understanding of his teaching. In what follows I have not scrupled to quote the same passage more than once to illustrate different points; some of his utterances are so important that if repetition does anything to impress them upon the reader, it is space well filled.

For any who are not familiar with St. John it should be premised that one of his strongest claims upon our confidence rests on his extreme impersonality. He describes throughout the progress of the "ideal" soul, with its sufferings, temptations, illuminations, and growth. In the individual it is probable that a thousand different circumstances may modify, suppress, prolong or exaggerate any one of these features; moreover, a soul, either by God's special action or its own fault or what we call accident, may have its normal development

arrested or accelerated either along the whole front of its activities or in a particular department. This should always be borne in mind when comparing St. John's scheme with that of other writers or with a concrete life-history. These latter may well bear to it some such relation as that which objects seen in a distorting mirror or microscope or slow-motion film bear to the same objects seen through no deflecting medium. But that St. John's scheme, taken with these reservations, is a scheme in touch with reality and of wide, not to say universal application, most of his readers will have little doubt.

I may be permitted to make two further introductory observations. The first concerns the subject matter of the books to be quoted.

The Ascent of Mount Carmel and *The Dark Night of the Soul* have every appearance of being descriptions, from different points of view, of the same process of sanctification. We may say in general that *The Ascent* describes the active element, *The Dark Night* the passive element in mortification and the acquisition of virtues. Naturally, the first must to some extent precede the second within each Night—the active Night of Sense comes before the passive—but as the whole Night of Sense precedes that of the Spirit the two books, for part of their course, overlap. The nights of Sense and Spirit, referred to in both, are two nights in all, not four. Such is at once the traditional and the obvious interpretation of St. John's doctrine. In recent years, however, an attempt has been made to show that the saint had in mind a succession of four processes and four nights, the two first active (of Sense and Spirit) the two last passive. In what follows this opinion will be dismissed altogether, as demonstrably groundless. It will be assumed that there are two Nights, of Sense and Spirit, each with an active and a passive element, and that in general the Night of Sense, in its totality, precedes the Night of the Spirit. With the latter we have no concern, except in so far as references to it are embedded in passages which must be quoted. The Night of the Soul, the title of St. John's book, includes, of course, both parts, Sense and Spirit. The word soul here is not synonymous with spirit.

The second introductory observation concerns the form

in which the quotations appear. St. John's works were not printed in his lifetime, and when printed (long before his beatification in 1674) were in many places considerably modified by cautious editors who were influenced by the controversies then in progress in Spain. All attempts to produce a critical edition based on the manuscripts failed till our own day. Consequently, the excellent English translation by David Lewis, made some seventy years ago, was based on the vulgate text. Within the last twenty years, however, two critical editions have appeared in Spain. Fr. Benedict Zimmerman, O.C.D., the most distinguished English student of St. John, kindly put me in the way of obtaining one of these, the edition of Padre Gerardo de S. Juan de la Cruz, which most authorities consider the better of the two, and it has been before me to check Lewis's translation. As in recent years there has been discussion over a number of passages, and as in every case where I have examined it the critical text clarifies the sense, adds consistency to the doctrine and bears out the traditional interpretation of the great Carmelite theologians, I have quoted the Spanish in a footnote wherever it differs from the English. But in no case do these differences affect the main lines of St. John's doctrine, and the reader will lose nothing essential if he disregards the footnotes altogether.¹

We can now, at long last, come to grips with St. John. The quotations will be from three books *The Ascent of Mount Carmel*, *The Dark Night of the Soul*, and *The Living Flame*. Even here some explanation is perhaps due to the reader for thus equating the three books, but my introduction has been long enough, and I shall reserve some words of explanation till we come to consider St. John's teaching on contemplative prayer. In all that follows, I give the passages, collected for my own information, which seemed to me on repeated re-reading to be the key-passages, but it would be foolish

¹ I quote from Lewis's translation (London, Thomas Baker). I quote *The Ascent* (1906) and *The Dark Night* (1924) by book, chapter and page as MC and DN, *The Living Flame* (1912) by page only as LF. The Spanish is quoted from the critical edition of Padre Gerardo (Toledo, 3 vols., 1912-14) by volume and page. The latest (1924) reprint of Lewis's *Dark Night* has some insertions (but by no means all) from Gerardo.

to hope that I have made the best, or even an adequate selection.

Let us first hear St. John's aim in writing at all. It is, he says, to give:

Solid and substantial doctrine suited to all, if they seek to advance to that detachment of spirit which is here described. My principal object, however, is not to address myself to all, but only to certain persons of our holy order of Mount Carmel, of the primitive observance.²

That is to say, surely, that his doctrine, in his opinion, is capable of universal application to such as share the aims and, in general, the means of sanctification enjoyed by Carmelites of the Reform. Having premised thus, St. John proceeds to enunciate his doctrine of the two kinds of night:

In order to reach perfection, the soul has to pass, ordinarily, through two kinds of night, which spiritual writers call purgations, or purifications, of the soul, and which I have called night because . . . the soul travels, as it were, by night, in darkness. . . . The first night is the night, or purgation, of the sensual part of the soul . . . which is the privation of, and purgation from, all sensual desires in all outward things of this world; all the pleasures of the flesh, and all the satisfactions of the will. . . . The second night is the night of the spiritual part.³

In a subsequent passage, the two aspects of the two nights are described:

Ordinarily, the soul enters this night of *sense* in two ways: one is the active way, the other is the passive. The active way is that in which the soul is able to make, and does make, efforts of its own to enter in (assisted by divine grace). . . . The passive way is that in which the soul does nothing, as of itself, neither does it make therein any efforts of its own; but it is God who works in it (giving special aids), and the soul is, as it were, patient (freely consenting thereto).⁴

As a soul grows in virtue, it comes to the point where it must enter into this night, active and passive. Refusal to do so is tantamount to refusing to advance:

Many persons begin to walk in the way of virtue—Our Lord longing to lead them into this dark night [that is, of the Soul, in all its divisions] that they may travel onwards

² MC, Prologue, 8.

³ MC, I, 10. I have transposed a sentence.

⁴ MC, I, xiii. 55. The words in italics are in the critical edition only; those between ordinary brackets are omitted by Gerardo, but are in Lewis. They are clearly glosses.

into the divine union—but make no progress; sometimes because they will not enter upon this night, nor suffer Him to lead them into it; and sometimes also because they do not understand their own state, and are destitute of fit and wise directors.⁵

Let us now consider St. John's more detailed descriptions of each division of the Night of Sense. The first shall be concerned with the active night:

The state of divine union consists in the total transformation of the will into the will of God, in such a way *that the soul has nothing in it contrary to the divine will*, and that every movement of the will shall be always the movement of the will of God only. . . . [Therefore] every [merely human] desire of the will must first of all be cast away, however slight it may be; that is, we must not deliberately and knowingly assent with the will to any imperfection.⁶

And, therefore, like the patriarch Jacob:

He . . . who will ascend to the mount of perfection . . . must CAST AWAY the strange gods, the earthly affections and attachments. He must PURIFY HIMSELF from the impressions which the desires have made on the soul, in the obscure night of sense, denying them and doing penance duly for them, and . . . he must change his garments. THIS GOD HIMSELF WILL DO [this is the passive night] during the observance of the first two commandments [i.e., those of renunciation and purification]; He will change them from old into new, by INFUSING INTO THE SOUL a new understanding of God . . . the human understanding being set aside, and a new love of God . . . the will being detached from its old desires and human satisfactions, BY BRINGING THE SOUL into a state of new knowledge and of deep delight . . . and, finally, BY CAUSING that which is of the old man to cease, which is our natural aptitude, and investing us with a new supernatural aptitude, corresponding with the powers of the soul, so that all that is human in the action of the soul may become divine. . . . One desire only doth God allow and suffer in His presence, that of perfectly observing His law, and of carrying the cross of Christ.⁷

I have given this passage at length, because it is one of the few where St. John gives in conjunction clear descriptions of the active and passive nights. It is, I

⁵ MC, Prologue 3-4.

⁶ MC, I, xi. 16. The words in italics are from the critical edition; those between square brackets have been added by myself to make the sense clear.

⁷ MC, I, v. 25. I have ventured to draw attention to the words expressing activity and passivity by printing them in capitals.

think, the only passage where he explicitly notes the concurrent action of the active and passive purifications; it is, therefore, an extremely important passage to remember, for St. John never makes a careless statement. It is also important as bringing together the two elements, active and passive, and then shifting back the reader's attention to the Divine Model. The human effort—the supernatural power—the command, the example, and the gift of God made Man—these are always behind every utterance of St. John, and make him the most central of all mystical theologians.

Let us now consider the passive night of sense and its beginning. This is the crucial point of St. John's scheme, and the point of the greatest practical importance for the guidance of a soul. Be it remembered that he is presupposing a desire for absolute surrender to God, and at least some progress in the active night of sense—that is, in detachment and poverty of spirit. When then does the passive purification begin? Here is his general answer:

Souls begin to enter the dark night when God is drawing them out of the state of beginners, which is that of those who meditate on the spiritual road, and is leading them into that of proficients, the state of contemplatives.⁸

And here is a more particular one:

Recollected persons [St. John, I take it, means those who live a life of recollection] enter the dark night sooner than others, after they have begun their spiritual course; because they are kept at a greater distance from the occasions of falling away, and because they correct more quickly their worldly desires, which is necessary in order to begin to enter the blessed night of sense. In general, there elapses no great length of time after they have begun before they enter the night of sense, and most of them do enter it.⁹

What is the purpose of this night? The *locus classicus* occurs after St. John has described the faults which distinguish those who are beginners in the spiritual life:

The soul [he writes] cannot be perfectly purified from these imperfections, any more than from the others [he has mentioned], until God shall have led it into the passive purgation of the dark night. . . . But it is expedient that the soul, so far as it can, should labour, on its own part,

⁸ DN, I, i. 5. But we must be careful to attach the right meaning to the word "beginners."

⁹ DN, I, viii. 36.

to purify and perfect itself, that it may merit from God to be taken under His divine care, and be healed from those imperfections which of itself it cannot remedy. For, after all the efforts of the soul, it cannot by any exertions of its own actively purify itself so as to be in the slightest degree fit for the divine union of perfection in the love of God, if God Himself does not take it into His own hands and purify it in the fire, dark to the soul, in the way I am going to explain.¹⁰

This is a passage of capital importance, which defines exactly the competence of active and passive purgation. St. John assumes this doctrine throughout, and occasionally repeats it in brief, as in the following passage :

For after all the exertions of beginners to mortify themselves in their actions and passions, their success will not be perfect, or even great, until God Himself shall do it for them *passively* in the purgation of the dark night.¹¹

And in discussing every vice or failing, and the means for its diminution, he constantly ends by saying that there is a residuum which can only be removed in the dark night.

What then is the principal agent, the active force, of the dark night? St. John answers: "This night—it is contemplation."¹² And more explicitly :

God is now working in the soul, in the state of contemplation . . . in such a way as to seem to have bound up all the interior faculties, leaving no help in the understanding, no sweetness in the will, no recollections in the memory [that is, with regard to the things of God].¹³

The first manifestation of the oncoming dark night of sense is, therefore, what St. John constantly calls "purgative aridity" and when he describes it in *The Dark Night* we meet once more, as in *Mount Carmel*, the signs by which we may distinguish it from merely occasional dryness, or that which is due to tepidity or physical causes. These we shall consider more fully

¹⁰ DN, I, iii. 16. This passage is important as showing that for St. John a soul can *merit* passive purification.

¹¹ DN, I, vii. 33. The word "*pasivamente*" comes from Gerardo.

¹² DN, I, viii. 33. Gerardo II, 25. "Esta noche que decimos ser la contemplación." This is another key-sentence.

¹³ DN, I, ix. 41.

later. He then proceeds to give the reason for this dryness :

God is transferring to the spirit the goods and energies of the senses, which . . . become dry, parched up, and empty; for the sensual nature of man is helpless in those things which belong to the spirit simply. . . . At first [the spirit] is not conscious of any spiritual sweetness and delight, but rather of aridities and distaste, because of the novelty of the change. The palate accustomed to sensible sweetness looks for it still. And because the spiritual palate is not prepared and purified for so delicious a taste until it shall have been for some time disposed for it in this arid and dark night, it cannot taste of the spiritual good but rather of aridity and distaste.¹⁴

But dryness is not the only factor in the purification :

During the aridities, then, of the night of sense . . . spiritual persons have to endure great afflictions, not so much because of aridity, but because they are afraid that they will be lost on this road; thinking that they are spiritually ruined [*note the strong words*] and that God has forsaken them. . . . Under these circumstances, if they meet with no one who understands the matter, these persons fall away, and abandon the right road; or become weak, or at least put hindrances in the way of their further advancement.¹⁵

I have purposely called the reader's attention to the strength of this description. It is essential that no one should confuse the night of sense with the setbacks which occur in the spiritual life of every devout person. St. John was well aware of these, and makes explicit reference to them.¹⁶ It would be the height of absurdity to apply to them the teaching of *The Dark Night*. It would be equally absurd to restrict that teaching to souls favoured by God to an altogether abnormal degree. Those who pass through the dark night are beginners indeed, compared with the length of road still to travel, but beginners who have counted the cost and are resolved to detach themselves from everything that is not God. No one, surely, who faces the facts of experience would expect to be able either to include in or to exclude from this category all members, let us say, of a religious community.

¹⁴ DN, I, ix. 39. Lewis's translation is awkward, but substantially correct.

¹⁵ DN, I, x. 44, 45.

¹⁶ DN, I, xiv. 71.

The essential factor, therefore, in the night of sense is the "purgative aridity," caused by dim contemplation, and having as its necessary consequence an anxiety of not serving God. St. John describes the process:

Secret contemplation keeps the soul in this state of anxiety [of not serving God] until, in the course of time, having purged the sensual nature of man, in some degree, of its natural forces and affections by means of the aridities it occasions, it shall have kindled within it this divine love. But, in the meantime, like a sick man in the hands of his physician, all it has to do, in the dark night and dry purgation of the desires, is to suffer, healing its many imperfections and practising many virtues.¹⁷

Such, it would seem, are the essential trials of the night of sense. But there are others, more painful, which occur besides. St. John describes one of them as follows:

The soul . . . not knowing the way it goeth, sees itself brought to nothing as to all things of heaven and earth, wherein it delighted before [*note once more the strong expressions*] and on fire with love, not knowing how. And because occasionally this fire of love grows in the spirit greatly, the longings of the soul for God are so deep that the very bones seem to dry up in that thirst, the bodily health to wither, the natural warmth and energies to perish in the intensity of that thirst of love.¹⁸

These are strong words, and that they can be used by St. John of those in the night of sense—those who, in his own words, are passing out of the "state of beginners"—should warn us not to treat that night lightly. Let us once more check the absolute exactness of his analysis by a concrete case. The writer of the following words had not, to the best of my knowledge, read the lines of St. John just quoted:

I was without trust in my own judgment and at the same time I had not the faith to abandon myself simply to Divine Providence. And this is roughly speaking my state at present; an absolute loss of confidence in oneself, and a feeling of complete helplessness. . . . The soul wants God but doesn't know where to turn to find Him. She also feels that the more she gives to God the more there is to give Him and the more He asks of her. And she feels happiness and pain all at once. Happiness because she is in His presence and realizes His infinite mercy and love; pain because she wants to do so much more than she is able to prove her gratitude and love, and because her wretchedness prevents

¹⁷ DN, I, xi. 50.

¹⁸ DN, I, xi. 49.

her giving herself entirely to God and possessing Him whom she so longs for.¹⁹

There is another class of trial, perhaps almost always present in some form, but which is reserved in its extreme shape for the strongest :

This night, in their case who are to enter into that other more awful night of the spirit, that they may go forward to the divine union of the love of God—it is not everyone, but only a few who do so in general—is attended with heavy trials and temptations of sense of long continuance, in some longer than others; for to some is sent the angel of Satan, the spirit of impurity, to buffet them with horrible and violent temptations of the flesh. . . . At other times this night is attended by the spirit of blasphemy. . . . Again, another hateful spirit, called by the prophet the “spirit of giddiness”, comes to torment them. This spirit so clouds their judgment that they are filled with a thousand scruples and perplexities so embarrassing that they can never satisfy themselves about them, nor submit their judgment therein to the counsel and direction of others.²⁰

Let those who are most experienced decide whether St. John’s words have anything of exaggeration in them.

So far the dry, bitter, purgative aspect of the night of sense has been stressed in the choice of extracts—rightly so, surely, for it is St. John’s doctrine that the purgation is the most beneficent and typical part of the night. But concurrently the beginnings of contemplative prayer are having a positive effect, an effect detailed as follows in *The Living Flame* :

The more rapidly it [the soul] attains to this calm tranquillity, the more abundant will be the infusion of the spirit of divine wisdom. . . . The least work of God in the soul in this state of holy rest and solitude is an inestimable good, transcending the very thought of the soul and of its spiritual guide, and though it does not appear so then, it will show itself in due time. . . . The interior goods which *this silent communication and contemplation* impresses on the soul without the soul’s consciousness of them, are of inestimable value, for they are the most secret and delicious unctions of the Holy Ghost, whereby He secretly fills the soul with the riches of His gifts and graces; for being God, He doeth the work of God as God.²¹

¹⁹ Private letter.

²⁰ DN, I, xiv. 68-9.

²¹ LF, 84-5. The words in italics come from Gerardo.

How long does the night of sense of last? St. John answers :

How long the soul will continue in this fast and penance of sense, cannot with certainty be told, because it is not the same in all, neither are all subjected to the same temptations. These trials are measured by the divine will, and are proportioned to the imperfections, many or few, to be purged away : and also to the degree of union in love to which God intends to raise the soul. That is the measure of its humiliations, both in their intensity and duration. Those who are strong and more able to bear suffering, are purified in more intense trials, and in less time.²²

And again :

This night, in their case who are to enter that other more awful night of the spirit, is attended with heavy trials and temptations of sense of long continuance, in some longer than others.²³

It would be rash to be definite where St. John is vague. Perhaps three years may be taken as forming neither a very short, nor an abnormally long, night of sense.

The night has an end, and an end as clearly defined as its beginning. St. John describes it as follows :—

When the house of sensuality was at rest, that is, when the passions were mortified, concupiscence quenched, the desires subdued and lulled to sleep in the blessed night of the purgation of sense, the soul began to set out on the way of the spirit, the way of proficients, which is also called the illuminative way, or the way of infused contemplation.²⁴

And again :

It must spend some time, perhaps years, after quitting the state of beginners, in exercising itself in the state of proficients. In this state—as one released from a rigorous imprisonment [*note once more the strong expressions*]—it occupies itself in divine things with much greater freedom and satisfaction, and its joy is more abundant and interior

²² DN, I, xiv. 70.

²³ DN, I, xiv. 68.

²⁴ DN, I, xiv. 68. For “proficients” Lewis has “beginners and proficients” which must be an endeavour to explain “*aprovechantes y aprovechados*” (those making progress and those who have made considerable progress) of the critical text. This classification is uncommon in St. John, but the meaning seems clear. The state of “beginners” is usually spoken of as lasting till the soul is in a fixed state of contemplation, when it joins the “proficients” (*aprovechados*); here St. John uses a new word “*aprovechantes*” to denote those who are beginning to contemplate, but are not fully established.

than it was in the beginning before it entered the night of sense. . . . It now rises at once to most tranquil and loving contemplation.²⁵

Here we can once again touch the exact moment in the concrete, though I am apprehensive that to some the phrases used may seem extravagant. They are not really so. Here then is one case :

By what seems a miracle of Divine Grace, for it simply happened without any effort on my part, both my mental attitude and my will are completely changed ; not to what they were before I was converted to the Faith, or when I was . . . professed [as a religious] . . . but to something incomparably more effective and spiritual, and emptied of all self.²⁶

And here is another :

Prayer [now] though often very distracted and never of a kind which could be accounted for afterwards, has been the presence of God—blank but not a misery-inducing blank—one which has given immense peace, confidence, and self-distrust.²⁷

With the further stages in the soul's growth according to St. John's scheme we are not concerned.

What, from all this, can be gathered as to the conduct to be adopted towards one who comes for help ?

I have given, in a previous article, some suggestions which seemed to me to be translations of St. John's teaching. Perhaps it may be well to summarize here such of them as bear more directly upon the night of sense.

I. The first necessity is a conviction that complete sincerity exists in the person concerned. This sincerity must influence his dealings, not only with his adviser, but with himself.

II. Some ability for perseverance and real sacrifice must have been shown, especially the sacrifice of what is natural and seen for what is supernatural and unseen. The ultimate external test must always be in good action. By their fruits ye shall know them. But this does not mean that perfection (least of all external perfection) must have been reached, or anything near it. Superficial imperfections and frailties often appear to be multiplied.

²⁵ DN, II, i. 72.

²⁶ Private letter.

²⁷ Private letter.

III. Love of prayer, perseverance in prayer, seeming inability to pray, must all be present.

IV. As regards the more special trials of the night of sense :

(a) The emergence of some tie of affection, not in itself demonstrably bad, but which the soul feels to be a bond, is a very common experience. Here there is no remedy but one. The counsel of St. Francis of Sales is the only safety. " Je crie tout haut. . . . ' Taillez, tranchez, rompez ' ; il ne faut pas s'amuser à découdre . . . il faut déchirer.'"²⁸ But such a cutting off must only be, can only be, with the deep, real will. The superficial, sensual affection will remain, to torment and to perplex.

(b) Another frequent experience is a strong desire for some outwardly stricter, more " perfect " form of life—for religion, for Carmel, for the Charterhouse. This is not to be confused with a real first vocation, nor with the temptation, common to the novitiate, which seeks perfection anywhere rather than at home. The desire of which we are here speaking comes (at least in full force) after the first decision has been made. It is partially, no doubt, the outcome of that conviction, of which St. John speaks, that the soul is in the wrong way and is ruined; it seeks refuge in the choice of some form of life which the natural reason says is hard. The basic imperfection here is the belief that the soul itself, by sheer hard effort, could win through to God. It must learn that God is the only worker, and that, therefore, God's Will alone matters.

(c) These, or similar, affections and desires may become a burning, searing presence in the mind, especially in times of prayer, so much so as sometimes to test almost to the limits of endurance. At the least they will be felt as a *malaise* which has never been experienced before.

(d) It is for the adviser to judge (and here he will be fortunate if he never judges wrong) whether any of these are due to overstrain or a purely natural flaw in the mind. In such a case the directions

²⁸ S. Francis of Sales, *Introduction à la vie dévote*, III, 21.

of St. Teresa (and of common-sense) are peremptory : let the person concerned avoid the prayer or practices that cause the strain. But it must be remembered—St. John insists—that God's action in passive purification may wear and fray the soul's powers of resistance very thin. Isolated moments of strain or loss of control should not be taken to condemn all. A natural flaw or weakness is often brought to the surface when the real effort is elsewhere, and sometimes it is the very instrument of purification. The ultimate external test between the action of grace and the action of nature must be a moral one, on a long view; grace leads to self-sacrifice, to giving, and to peace; the natural self to self-centredness, refusal and unquiet.

V. The virtues of faith and humility will assume an increasing importance and the conception of them will grow enormously in depth; there will be an altogether new realization of inability and insufficiency, together (as a rule) with a fairly clear judgment on concrete points of conduct; a desire to give all to God, with a lively sense that only God can make the gift possible and worthy.

VI. Finally, and in some ways most significant of all, there will be a sense of being lost, and of needing intensely the guidance of the Holy Spirit, together with a conviction that such guidance will at last be given—nay, is being given all the while. The soul will make its own the noble lines which Browning gives to Paracelsus :

“ I go to prove my soul!
I see my way as birds their trackless way.
I shall arrive! what time, what circuit first
I ask not : but unless God sends His hail
Or blinding fire-balls, sleet or stifling snow,
In some time, His good time, I shall arrive :
He guides me and the bird.”

(To be concluded)

THE PRIEST'S LIFE IN ITS ENVIRONMENT TO-DAY

V. THE PLANNING AND DESIGNING OF PRESBYTERIES.

BY JOSEPH GOLDIE.

THE essentials of planning and designing a Presbytery do not differ to any great extent from those of an ordinary domestic dwelling, in so far as concerns the general construction of the building, and the aspect and distribution of the various rooms. In this article I propose to deal with buildings of first-class construction and with modern and labour-saving appliances, buildings which cost on an average from one shilling and sixpence to two shillings per cubic foot.

I will first enumerate certain essential points in the construction of the building as apart from the planning. It may be argued that these essential points of sound construction are self-evident, and may be taken as read, but I make no apology for mentioning them in this article, because they are so vitally important, not only to the stability of the building, but also to the health and comfort of the occupants, and also because many of these important points are often overlooked.

It is unnecessary to detail the construction of the foundations as these will obviously be governed by the nature of the subsoil, but as a general rule the foundation trenches should not be less than four feet deep. At this depth the wall footings and foundation concrete are safeguarded from the action of the weather. This rule is most important in the case of clay subsoils, which are apt to crack and shrink under atmospheric action. The foundation concrete should be at least nine inches thick, and should if necessary be reinforced with steel or expanded metal.

The external walls, if built of brick, should be eleven-inch hollow walls or fourteen-inch solid walls, and if in a position exposed to strong winds and driving rain,

they should be rendered or roughcast externally, the cement used for this being treated with an anti-damp preparation, of which there are many reliable brands on the market. Walls built of the thicknesses mentioned keep a building warm in winter and cool in summer. All walls must have a proper damp course laid at least six inches above ground level, asphalt laid in two thicknesses being the best material for this. A layer of concrete, at least four inches thick, laid on a foundation of dry rubble, consisting of broken bricks or other suitable material, should cover the site of the building between the external walls. The ground floor joists are laid on this concrete, the spaces round the joists being properly ventilated by air bricks built into the external walls, so as to ensure a through current of air round the joists. This ventilation is a preventative of dry-rot.

The inner walls or partitions and the upper floors should be sound proof, and the timbers of the upper floors should be ventilated in the same manner as those of the ground floor.

The roof, whether slated or tiled, should be boarded, felted, battened and counter-battened. If there be any flat roofs they should be covered with two layers of natural rock asphalt laid on a seating of felt. The chimney stacks should have a damp course laid as near above the lead flashing as possible.

The foregoing details constitute in the main the elements of good sound construction, and my readers will, no doubt, breathe a sigh of relief when I say that I have finished this somewhat dry dissertation of building construction, and come now to the more interesting topic of the planning and equipment of the building.

I propose to deal first with the planning of a Presbytery for a small or average size parish, a building designed to accommodate two priests, a housekeeper and a maid. I will assume that the building is of the non-basement type, that the building site is open and unrestricted, and that the building can be planned in as compact and economical a way as possible, that is to say, without waste of space in corridors, passages, etc.

I will begin by describing the ground floor plan. The front entrance door should open into a small vestibule

or porch separated from the main entrance hall by a glazed swing door. This vestibule will cut off direct draught from the main hall when the front entrance door is opened and also help to keep the house warm. A small waiting room should open off this vestibule or porch, where people may be interviewed whom it is not desirable to admit into the main hall.

The following rooms will open on to the main hall. A sitting room about sixteen feet by thirteen feet. Dining room about sixteen feet by eleven feet. Waiting or Reception room about ten feet by twelve feet. Coat cupboard or small cloak room and lavatory and W.C. The kitchen should be near the dining room with windows facing a northerly direction. Opening off the kitchen are the housekeeper's and maid's bedrooms, these two rooms being separated by a lobby giving access to a W.C. and bath room fitted with a lavatory basin. The size of the kitchen should be not less than fourteen feet by twelve feet. A scullery fitted with sink and draining boards should open out of the kitchen, and this room should be large enough to accommodate a gas copper or washing machine for minor laundry work. The larder should not open directly into the kitchen, but should be placed, say, off the lobby leading to the tradesmen's entrance. The larder should face a northerly aspect and should be cross ventilated. Ample cupboard space should be provided in the domestic quarters.

A Garage of minimum size, of fourteen feet by ten feet, should be built near the house, and a connecting passage or covered way from the entrance hall to the sacristy of the adjoining Church should where possible be included in the plan.

The foregoing distribution of rooms completes the ground floor plan. On the first floor is the Rector's bedroom, about sixteen feet by twelve feet; the Curate's bedroom, say, sixteen feet by ten feet; and a spare bedroom about the same size. These three bedrooms should have built-in cupboards and lavatory basins. A roomy bath room, a W.C., linen cupboard and small store or box room complete the first floor plan.

If casement windows are preferred to the sash type, they must be of the "easy cleaning" pattern and be fitted with ventilation hoppers.

The building is centrally heated throughout, the radiators being placed under the windows. The heating plant may conveniently be run from the boiler room of the adjoining Church.

It will be noted that in the foregoing description I have assumed that it is possible to plan the servants' bedrooms on the ground floor. If this is not possible, and these rooms have to be placed on the first floor, then they should be approached by a separate staircase and a door provided between the domestic quarters and the main portion of the first floor, the aim being always to keep the domestic quarters a self-contained unit.

I will now describe what I may call a typical plan for a large Presbytery, accommodating four or five priests, a housekeeper and two or three maids. I will again assume, as in the case of the smaller Presbytery, that the building is of the non-basement type, and I will start, as before, by describing the ground floor plan.

The same arrangement of the entrance porch or vestibule with adjoining waiting room as before described will again be planned. The main entrance hall will necessarily be of generous dimensions as several rooms will open off it. These will be the dining room, eighteen feet by fourteen feet; two waiting or reception rooms, about twelve feet by ten feet; the Rector's private office and reception room, about fourteen feet by twelve feet; and a roomy cloak room with W.C. and lavatory attached. A telephone switch-board should be placed in a convenient position near the door leading from the entrance hall to the domestic quarters.

Next to the dining room should be planned a pass pantry or servery with a door leading to the dining room and a service hatch. Cupboards fitted for glass and china should be provided in this room together with a sink and draining boards. Next to this room is the kitchen, about sixteen feet by fourteen feet; scullery, about fourteen feet by eight feet; maids' sitting room, about the same size as the kitchen and the housekeeper's private room and store. A W.C. and lavatory, large larder, planned as before described, with an extra store room or large cupboard, and a fuel store complete the domestic offices.

A separate staircase will connect these offices with the maids' bedrooms on the first floor and a small goods-lift should also be provided between these two floors. The main stairs from the entrance hall to the first floor should be at least three feet wide with easy-going treads and risers.

On the first floor will be the Rector's suite, consisting of sitting room and bedroom. These two rooms should be separated by a lobby, opening on to the landing or corridor, off which should be planned a bath room and W.C.

The Curates' suites will consist of a sitting room with bedroom adjoining, planned in such a manner as to be entered by a separate door from the landing so that the maid may enter the bedroom without passing through the sitting room. These bedrooms should be sufficiently large so as to comfortably accommodate the bed, lavatory basin, wardrobe, etc. Two bath rooms and two W.C.'s should be provided for the Curates.

In addition to the foregoing accommodation, two spare bedrooms should be provided, one of, say, fourteen feet by twelve feet with bath room and W.C. attached, and the other of smaller dimensions. A large linen cupboard and a box room will complete this portion of the first floor.

The maids' quarters on the first floor will consist of four bedrooms, bath room, W.C., housemaid's closet and box room.

The whole building should be centrally heated, and telephones installed in the Rector's sitting room and private reception room, the Curates' sitting rooms, and the housekeeper's private room.

The following rooms should be provided with open fireplaces. The Rector's and Curates' sitting rooms, the dining room and the Rector's reception room, and these fireplaces should be provided with gas points for gas fires if preferred. Electric power points must be provided in convenient positions for vacuum cleaners.

The Garage should be large enough to accommodate two motor cars and should be within easy access of the house.

If it is possible to do so, I would advise that the boilers for the central heating plant and the domestic

hot water supply be placed in the Church boiler room and that these boilers be oil fuelled. Though the initial cost of installing an oil burning equipment is perhaps rather expensive, the average cost being about £175, and although oil as a fuel is more expensive than coke, the extra outlay in installing the equipment and the higher cost of the fuel will be more than compensated by the saving of labour in stoking a coke-fired boiler and clearing away the clinkers and ashes, and also by the elimination of soot and dust.

For the decoration of the walls of the rooms, I would recommend oil paint or distemper as being more hygienic than wall-paper. The kitchen, scullery, bath rooms and W.C.'s should have glazed tiled walls.

For floor covering generally throughout the building I would advise rubber. There is again the initial cost of rubber as a floor covering to be considered, but as for so many other things, this cost is more than compensated for in the long run. Rubber is non-slippery, practically unwearable, silent and comfortable to walk on, warm to the feet, and easily kept clean.

For the glazing of the windows, especially in buildings situated in large manufacturing districts, the use of the new patent "Vita" glass is to be strongly recommended. This glass has the property of allowing the passage through it of the ultra-violet sun-rays, a property which ordinary plate and sheet glass do not possess, and its use is a great health benefit to the occupants of the building.

Mouldings to doors, architraves, cornices, etc., should be sparingly made use of, and if used, should be designed in such a manner as not to harbour dust in hollows which are difficult to keep clean.

I think that I may take it for granted, as I have done in this article, that electricity is available for lighting and power. With regard to the lighting, the use of daylight lamps or daylight globe fittings will be found of great benefit to the eyesight, and should be used throughout the building.

While writing this article, I have had actual plans of buildings I have myself designed in my mind's eye, and perhaps my readers may find it rather difficult to picture the plans from the descriptions that I have given;

but I hope that I have made myself as clear as possible, and that I have not been too technical.

I think that I may say, without fear of contradiction, that buildings such as I have described, will be found to be healthy and comfortable to live in.

THE VENERATION OF THE MARTYRS IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH

BY THE RT. REV. MGR. J. P. KIRSCH, D.D., Ph.D.,

Professor of Patrology at Fribourg University.

THE veneration, "worship" (in the specific sense of the term) of the saints, as expressed in the liturgy of the Church and in the private lives of the faithful, has been, since Christian antiquity, an important element in the life of the Catholic Church. The Council of Trent in its twenty-fifth session expressly declared by dogmatic definition that it is both permissible and profitable to venerate the saints. This worship had its origin in the veneration shown to the first Christian *martyrs*. These witnesses who shed their blood for Christ, whose steadfast profession of faith cost the sacrifice of their lives, were the first, and until the fifth century, the only Christian heroes venerated in a special manner by the Church, and honoured by the faithful, who invoked their intercession with God and with Christ. We shall try to establish the origin and the character of this religious cultus of the martyrs, to throw light on the way in which it was manifested, and to expose its historical development during the first centuries of the Church.

I.

The martyrs, those who, during the persecutions of the Christian Church, paid with their lives for their fidelity to Christ, either directly through violent death, or from the hardships of exile, were held in the highest esteem among the faithful from the earliest days of the Church's existence. Martyrdom, death for Christ's sake, was considered the happiest lot, the highest glory to which a Christian could attain. Was not such a death the one infallible way of being intimately united for ever with the Saviour, and of entering immediately upon the joys of eternal bliss? This conception, which was without parallel in the ancient world, sprang

directly out of Christian soil. Had not Christ Himself expressly announced: "Blessed are they who suffer persecution for justice' sake, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven. Blessed are ye when they shall revile you, and persecute you, and speak all that is evil against you untruly, for my sake. Be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very great in Heaven" (Matth. v. 10-12)? Already at the beginning of the second century the saintly bishop and martyr, Ignatius of Antioch, in a letter addressed to the Christians of Rome on the eve of his martyrdom, gives expression to this viewpoint in a most touching manner. In this letter he beseeches them not to do anything which might deprive him of a martyr's death and not demand his pardon of the emperor. "I exhort you, be ye not of unseasonable kindness to me. Let me be given to the wild beasts, for through them I can attain unto God. I am God's wheat, and I am ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found pure bread of Christ" (fourth chapter). "May nought of things visible or invisible hinder me; that I attain unto Jesus Christ. Come fire and cross and grapplings with wild beasts, cuttings and manglings, wrenching of bones, hacking of limbs, crushing of my whole body, come cruel tortures of the devil to assail me. Only let me attain to Jesus Christ" (fifth chapter). "The furthest bounds of the universe shall profit me nothing, neither the kingdoms of this world. It is better for me to die for Jesus Christ rather than to reign over the farthest bounds of the earth. Him I seek, who died for us, Him I desire, who rose again for our sake" (sixth chapter).

Here we see from the heartfelt writing of *one* martyr the sentiments with which the first Christians regarded death suffered for Christ. Martyrdom was counted the highest expression of the love of God and of Jesus Christ, and as such supplied baptism for the catechumens who were martyred before their baptism. They attained as surely to their Lord in Heaven as those who through baptism had already been made members of the Church. The martyrs were reckoned the holiest and most perfect disciples of the divine Master Christ. From this conception of martyrdom arose naturally the veneration in which the martyrs were held by the faithful. The Christian writers of the second and third centuries give full and eloquent expression to this veneration. While

the faithful confessors of Christ were in prison awaiting their condemnation they were objects of loving care by all the faithful. Was not the grace of God and the power of the Holy Spirit with them in a special manner? Christians who, owing to some grave moral fall, had been subjected to public penance (Exomologesis) often begged their condemned brethren to recommend them to the bishops in order to obtain a speedier reconciliation and admittance to the Eucharist. And the bishops took these recommendations into account because of their veneration for the martyrs. The high esteem in which these confessors were held did not die with them but rather increased after they had sealed their confession of faith by a violent death. Judging from the opinions most frequently put forward, it was generally held in Christian antiquity that complete participation in eternal bliss would be enjoyed by the faithful departed only after the end of the world and the final judgment. The martyrs alone, according to the firm conviction of the early Christians, entered immediately into the full possession of eternal happiness in Christ. To them was reserved the glory of being considered the privileged friends of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ in His heavenly kingdom. For this reason they were invoked as patrons and intercessors for all, living as well as dead, whose needs they could recommend to the Lord. The early Christians were firmly convinced that the intercession of the martyrs carried great weight with Christ and with His heavenly Father, and that these saints could therefore procure for their clients grace and aid. As a result of this conviction they appealed with confidence to the martyrs, begging their intercession and protection. At the same time they expressed in their prayers the peculiar veneration and esteem in which they held these holy men and women and thanked God for the heroic gift of faith given to them.¹

It was this conception of the special privileges enjoyed in Heaven by the martyrs, which gave birth to the liturgical cultus of the martyrs in the Ancient Church. Already at a very early period the Christians began to commemorate the departed by holding special religious

¹ J. P. Kirsch : *The Doctrine of the Communion of Saints in the Ancient Church*. Translated by Rev. J. R. McKee of the Oratory. (Sands : Edinburgh and London, 1910.)

services for them on certain days, particularly the anniversaries of deaths or burials, designated by the faithful as "birthdays" (*dies natalis*). The memorial celebration on such a day was, in the second century, universally held by the family, friends and relations of the departed.² And, as in the case of other Christians, special services were also celebrated in memory of the martyrs, particularly on the anniversaries of their deaths. But this memorial service did not at first develop into a regular yearly celebration of the feast by the Christian community. We can see this from the fact that, in Rome for instance, the anniversary of not a single Roman martyr of the second century was regularly kept in Christian antiquity. Neither Pope Telesphorus, who gave his life for the faith in A.D. 136, nor the apologist Justin of Rome, who died a martyr between 163 and 167, nor any of the Roman martyrs of the period preceding A.D. 200, whose names have been handed down to us by authentic historical tradition, are to be found in the Christian calendars of the fourth and fifth centuries, or in the oldest Roman Sacramentaries. Apparently there was no established liturgical tradition of feasts celebrated in their honour. The only exception was the feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul who suffered martyrdom under Nero. From the second half of the third century, this feast was already kept on the 29th of June, a date, however, which had no reference to the death-day of the apostles, and so could not originate in an anniversary kept from the beginning, but was connected rather with the erection on the Appian Way, near S. Sebastiano, of a monument to the apostles (Ad Catacumbas). Here the feast of Peter and Paul was first celebrated in A.D. 258 and then kept annually on the same day.

We can safely say, however, that from the end of the second century the annual commemoration of a Christian martyr, celebrated on the anniversary of his or her death, began to assume a specific character, and to develop into a permanent liturgical feast kept by the Christian communities.

This specific character, which distinguished from the

² Freistedt: *Altchristliche Totengedächtnistage und ihre Beziehung zum Jenseitsglauben und Totenkultus der Antike*. Münster 1, W., 1928.

memorial services held for other departed Christians the liturgical celebration on the anniversary of a martyr's death, was determined chiefly by three factors, intimately connected with the peculiar conception of the martyr's privileges, of which we have already spoken. These factors were: (1) the service for the martyr took a special tenor from the prayers recited during the Eucharistic sacrifice. There were no prayers for the repose of the soul of the martyr, but rather God was thanked for the glory He had conferred upon His confessor, while grace and help were implored through the intercession of the saint in Heaven. The chant and lessons were inspired by the same conception. (2) The memorial service for the martyrs was celebrated not only by the family and friends of the saint but by the whole community together with the bishop and clergy. It was a regular liturgical festival in celebration of the victory achieved by the martyr in question. (3) The feast held on the first anniversary was repeated each year on the same day, a usage which was never observed in the case of the other faithful departed.

These festivals with their solemn celebration of the Eucharist in memory of the martyr of the day became with time a religious institution in the Christian communities, resembling the solemnity of the Sunday and other feasts of the Lord. They formed a part of the liturgical year, and as such survived in the Church, so that we still keep the feasts of the Roman martyrs on the very days which were fixed for them in the Christian calendars of the fourth century.

The earliest proofs of these special liturgical feasts for the anniversaries of the martyrs are to be found in Asia Minor and North Africa. In the acts of St. Polycarp of Smyrna, which date from the second half of the second century, it is distinctly said³ that the faithful hoped "to gather round his tomb in gladness and joy for the celebration of the 'birthday' of his martyrdom." In the most ancient calendar of the Church of Carthage we find mention of the martyrs of Scili in North Africa whose deaths occurred in the year 180. In the same calendar we find the "*dies natalis*" of SS. Felicitas and Perpetua (A.D. 202 or 203), whose feast was celebrated also in Rome in the fourth century,

³ *Martyrium S. Polycarpi*, cap. 18.

a coincidence which goes to prove the existence of an ancient tradition dating from the time of their death. In the third century the Roman Church also began to honour the memory of her glorious martyrs by special religious festivals held regularly every year. In the first half of the third century this distinction was conferred only upon Roman bishops who had suffered martyrdom (Callistus, Pontianus, Fabianus), and upon some particularly eminent martyrs such as Hippolytus, while from the second half of the third century it became more universal. In a Christian calendar for the city of Rome, which dates from about the year 400,⁴ fifty-three days of the year are marked as having celebrations in honour of the Roman martyrs who had died during the persecutions, a brilliant record of eminent confessors of the faith of whom the Roman Church might be justly proud.

We also find records dating from the third century of particular memorial services held in honour of local martyrs among many scattered communities of the ancient Church. We can, therefore, conclude that it was at this time already customary in the whole Church to honour the memory and triumph of the martyr on the anniversary of his death by a solemn celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice which was attended by the clergy and the whole community.⁵

II.

The *tomb of the martyr* formed, from the beginning, the object round which liturgical worship and private devotion centred. This fact finds eloquent expression in the account given of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp (chapter eighteen), of which we have already given a few sentences, and which deserves to be quoted in full because of the excellent manner in which it renders the sentiments of the early Christians with regard to the relics of the martyrs. "The centurion, therefore, seeing the opposition raised on the part of the Jews, set him in the midst and burnt him after their custom. And

⁴ J. P. Kirsch: *Der stadtrömische christliche Festkalender im Altertum*. (Münster 1, Westf.: 1924.)

⁵ Compare on this subject matter *Les Origines du Culte des Martyres*. (H. Delehaye, S.J. Brussels, 1912.)

so we afterwards took up his bones which are more valuable than precious stones and finer than refined gold and laid them in a suitable place; where the Lord will permit us to gather ourselves together, as we are able, in gladness and joy, and to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom for the commemoration of those that have already fought in the contest and for the training and preparation of those that shall do so hereafter." The sentiments here expressed by the Christians of Smyrna are typical of the attitude of the whole Ancient Church. Both in the form of official liturgical worship on the part of the community, as also of private religious practices on the part of individuals, the outward expression of the veneration for the martyrs centred round their tombs.

It was at the tomb that the liturgical assembly for the yearly commemoration of their death took place. If the tomb was contained in one of the sepulchral chambers of a Christian cemetery, either above or below ground, large enough for the purpose, then the Divine mysteries were celebrated in the chamber itself, the altar being placed over the grave or as near it as possible. If the body was deposited in a narrow crypt or in one of the passages of a subterranean cemetery, the service was held in a larger "cella" erected over the catacomb. In the fourth century the smaller subterranean chambers which contained a martyr's grave were everywhere extended and made into chapels large enough to contain a certain number of the faithful. That the Eucharistic sacrifice was actually offered in honour of the martyrs in the crypts of the Roman catacombs, where they were buried, is evident from the fact that a permanent altar was often erected there, as in the churches. Well-known examples of this are the Popes' vault in the catacomb of St. Callistus and the chapel of St. Hippolytus in the cemetery bearing his name. To these may be added the recently discovered martyrs' crypt in the catacomb of Pamphilus where the altar, erected against the wall containing the martyr's grave, is in almost complete preservation.⁶ When the Church

⁶ E. Josi in the *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, 1924, pages 15-119. J. P. Kirsch in the *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte*, 1926, pages 1-12.

began to enjoy peace under Constantine and his successors, great basilicas were erected over the burial places of the martyrs in order to provide a lasting monument, and, at the same time, a building suitable for the liturgical festivals held in their honour.

Just as, at Rome, Constantine caused a magnificent basilica with double aisles to be erected on the Vatican hill over the tomb of the Prince of the Apostles and another, smaller one, to mark the resting-place of the apostle Paul, so churches, smaller and larger, began to spring up everywhere, both in the East and West, over the tombs of the martyrs, and became centres for the veneration of these saints. Every effort was made to build the church in such a manner that the original tomb, contained in its crypt, was to be found directly under the high-altar. This close connection between the martyr's grave and the Eucharistic altar is eloquently commented upon already in one of the poems of Prudentius.⁷ If the tomb or crypt were sunk considerably below the altar, steps were constructed so that pious pilgrims might be enabled to visit it. This was naturally the case when the tomb was in an underground cemetery, as the martyr's basilicas were generally erected on the ground level. In some cases, however, the Christians, undeterred by the extra labour involved, excavated the entire area of the church so as to build it on a level with the subterranean tomb, and be able to place the altar directly over the relics. This, for instance, is the case with the Roman basilicas of St. Agnes, St. Hermes, and of SS. Nereus and Achilles. During the fourth and fifth centuries vast numbers of basilicas were erected over the tombs of martyrs in different parts of the Roman Empire. They are the best proof of the extraordinary veneration in which the martyrs were held at that period. Another token of this peculiar veneration is the practice of placing the remains of the martyr in the closest possible proximity to the altar upon which Christ's body and blood was offered in the Eucharist.

Where there was a basilica the annual liturgical feast in honour of the martyr was attended by vast crowds of the faithful. But on other days also Christians had

⁷ Prudentius : *Peristephanon*, Hymnus XI "de S. Hippolyto," v. 170-174. Edition Migne : Patr. Lat. Tome LX, p. 548-549.

the Eucharistic sacrifice offered up by a priest at the tomb for some special intention or through private devotion. The ceremony was then, of course, simpler and more private in character. For not only the official liturgical cult of the martyrs focussed round their tombs, these became also centres of private devotion. Whenever the faithful wished to express their veneration, their joy in the triumphant victory and eternal reward of the martyrs, or to implore their intercession as the special friends of Christ, they naturally found their way to the tomb where through contact with the saint's earthly remains they felt as it were more in touch with his glorified spirit. Such pilgrims often engraved their names on the walls of the crypt, with the addition of a short prayer, intended, no doubt, to recommend them to the saint even after they had left the shrine. In the Roman catacombs these writings on the walls (graffiti) form the surest indication that the bones of a martyr once rested in the immediate vicinity.

During the third and fourth centuries in particular the devotion of the faithful often took the form of bringing with them food of a simple nature which they then consumed at the grave as a sort of memorial feast (*refrigerium*). This custom, which reminds us of the funeral agape, common in the early centuries, led to abuses, especially when, on the anniversary of the martyr's death, large numbers of the faithful shared in the meal. The custom was in consequence gradually suppressed by the bishops at the end of the fourth century. St. Ambrose forbade it at Milan, as we know from the *Confessions of St. Augustine* (Book VI, Chapter 2), where he relates of his mother, St. Monica: "Therefore, when, according to the custom of Africa, she had brought with her to the memorials of the saints, food and bread and wine, and was stopped by the door-keeper; as soon as ever she understood that the bishop had prohibited these things, she piously and obediently conformed to his orders; and I admired that she should so suddenly become, rather an accuser of her former practice, than a disputer of the present prohibition."

Devotion to the martyrs also inspired the faithful to seek for themselves a resting-place after death as near to the martyr's tomb as possible. They hoped in this way to be remembered by the saint, and to obtain his

intercession for their souls when they had departed into the other world. In the ancient Christian cemeteries we everywhere find the space round a martyr's tomb crowded with graves constructed at a later period. Under the pavements of basilicas, built over the relics of martyrs, the graves are closely packed, often one over the other, while round such memorial churches tomb upon tomb was erected to meet the desire of the faithful to be buried as near to the martyr as possible. The excavations in and round the Basilica of St. Sebastian on the Appian Way, near Rome, and the researches in connection with the Church of the Seven Sleepers near Ephesus in Asia Minor have brought to light interesting facts bearing on this subject.

A further feature in the cultus of the martyrs, and one which, in the fourth century, became practically universal in the Ancient Church, was the *veneration of relics*. The tendency of the human heart to preserve through the medium of material things a memory of those near and dear led naturally to this form of devotion. It was counted as the highest favour when some portion of the bodily substance of the martyr—a piece of cloth soaked with the blood, some of the ashes remaining after the body had been burnt, or fragments of bones—could be obtained and kept for veneration. In Christian Antiquity the existence of such relics, in the narrower sense of the word, is, however, only attested for the East. In Rome and in the greater part of the Western world the general feeling in the Early Ages was that the remains of the martyr should be all enclosed in his grave and should there remain undisturbed. Because of this view only objects which had touched the martyr's tomb, and in this way had been sanctified, were here chosen as relics; for instance, pieces of stuff which had been laid on the grave, stones or dust taken from the tomb, drops of oil from the lamps that burned in the vaults where the martyrs were buried and other such things. These relics (*benedictiones, sanctuaria*) were kept by the faithful in their houses, treasured and honoured in little chapels or carried in crosses worn round the neck; they were also, and chiefly, enclosed in the altars of the churches with the idea of in this way consecrating the altar to the martyr. Such altars containing relics were as much honoured as the martyr's

grave itself; and were, like the latter, visited by the faithful who wished to show their devotion and to implore intercession. In this way the tombs again formed a centre from which the cultus of the martyrs spread to the remotest district to which such relics had been brought. In an ever increasing degree the veneration for the martyrs became, from the end of the third century, a characteristic and popular feature of Christian life, and an important factor in the development of the religious civilization of the centuries.

Incidentally the celebration of the feasts of the martyrs led also to the compiling of the first *Christian calendars*. To recall to the faithful on what day and in which church the yearly memorial service in honour of a certain martyr would take place, these days were specially noted in the order in which they occurred in the calendar, and to each were added the name of the saint and the cemetery in which his grave was to be found. Such calendars were particularly useful in the large towns, in which a certain number of saints were honoured with liturgical solemnity. The oldest example which we possess of this kind of calendar is the *Depositio martyrum* of the Roman Church which is to be found in the Chronograph of A.D. 354, and probably goes back to the year 336. This Calendar of Feasts begins with the Nativity of Our Lord on the 25th of December and then gives notices of Christian feasts for twenty-three days of the year. Among these eighteen are commemoration days for Roman martyrs, and beside the name of the saint we find that of the cemetery in which the tomb was situated, and where the memorial service would be held. For two days of the year martyrs of the Port of Rome (Porto) are given. On the 7th of March the feast of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas is marked, and on the 14th of September that of S. Cyprian, from which we may conclude that the memory of these African martyrs was held in honour at Rome already in the fourth century, because of the numbers of the faithful who came on business from Africa to Rome.⁸ We possess a similar calendar for Carthage, but from the sixth century. At that time the cult of the martyrs

⁸ W. Howard Frere: *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy*, T. 1. *The Kalendar* (Alcuin Club Collections, t. XXVIII). Oxford University Press, 1930.

had assumed a more universal character and therefore we find in this calendar not only the names of African martyrs but of many others whose feasts were then kept at Carthage.

III.

When the cult of the martyrs first began, each community honoured its own martyrs on the anniversaries of their deaths by special liturgical festivals. Some neighbouring communities at most shared in the celebration and each martyr had only one spot consecrated to his memory, namely, the church or crypt which held his tomb. It was only in the fourth century that a certain new development set in, which led eventually to the general veneration of a great number of martyrs throughout extensive regions and in distant provinces. We first meet with examples of the cultus of a martyr spreading beyond his home-country or final resting-place, in the case of such eminent saints as Peter and Paul or others of the apostles; then in the case of martyrs who were invoked in special necessities, such as Menas of Egypt, Cosmas and Damian of Cilicia, whose help was implored in illness; finally, in the case of certain other renowned examples like Stephen the Protomartyr, Laurence of Rome, Cyprian of Carthage and those martyrs in particular whose acts, historical or legendary, were widely read. The new custom of extending the cultus of a martyr far beyond the limits of his own community found active expression in various directions.

Newly-built churches, for example, were dedicated as a votive offering to such martyrs as the founders particularly revered. We know that when, at the beginning of the fifth century, the Roman matron, Vestina, founded a titular church at Rome, as a residence for Roman priests who should devote themselves to the needs of the faithful in that quarter of the town, she dedicated the basilica of the *Titulus* to the memory of the martyrs of Milan, Gervasius and Protasius and to St. Vitalis (the present Church of S. Vitale in Rome). Various dedicatory inscriptions of basilicas have been discovered in Northern Africa which show that the churches to which they belonged were dedicated either to the apostles Peter and Paul or to Peter only. Similar customs prevailed in all the provinces of the Christian Roman Empire of the East as well as of the West.

As a consequence, even those older places of divine worship within the city, which had been originally no more than assembly rooms for the celebration of the Eucharist and other liturgical services, were now, when re-built or enlarged, also dedicated to a martyr. We can follow this development particularly well in the case of the old titular churches of Rome. These were, at first, only rooms in Roman houses, reserved for the liturgical service. They were called after the donor who had given or bequeathed to the Roman community the house in question as a residence for Roman priests and a place where divine worship could be offered. When Pope Damasus (†384) transformed a house belonging to him into a titular church he dedicated the newly-erected chapel of the *Titulus* to St. Lawrence. At a later period the donors of the old titular churches were often identified with saints of the same name or came themselves to be regarded as saints. So it came about that in the sixth century all the older places of worship in Rome appeared to be churches consecrated to martyrs.⁹

The extension of the cultus of the martyrs was again closely connected with the veneration of relics. In the countless churches in memory of the martyrs which were founded in the second half of Christian Antiquity in every corner of Christendom, an effort was always made to obtain relics of the martyr and to have them enclosed in the altar. In the West this went so far that an altar without relics was practically unthinkable and in the early Middle Ages it even became a rule of the Church that when an altar was to be consecrated, relics should be enclosed in it. From this custom and viewpoint the usage developed of erecting more than one altar in the churches. In the beginning each church had but one altar, the table used for the celebration of the Eucharist and the Lord's Supper. But, as the pious habit of enclosing the relics of a martyr in the altar became more universal, there grew up in the West the custom of having, besides the high altar at the entrance of the choir, special chapels arranged in other parts of the church with altars in which a place could be found for relics which the faithful wished to honour in a special manner.

⁹ J. P. Kirsch: *Die Römischen Titelkirchen im Altertum (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, IX, 1-2)*. Paderborn, 1918.

The fact that devotion to various particularly renowned martyrs spread to districts far from the places in which they had lived and died also led to a marked development of the calendar. In all the different places where churches had been dedicated to martyrs, a festal celebration took place either on the day of the martyr's death or on the anniversary of the dedication of the church and the transference of the relics; for these churches, possessing an altar with a martyr's relics, were considered in a way as memorial basilicas and an effort was made to keep the feast as solemnly as at the actual tomb. In the Western world it was chiefly in honour of the Roman martyrs that churches were built everywhere, and as they all insisted on keeping their particular feasts, the calendar in the Western liturgies became rich in saint's days. Besides the regular Christian calendars, in which the feasts actually celebrated in the chief churches and in the dioceses were marked, there came into existence with time other lists in which were entered all the martyrs of a larger area or even of the whole church, in so far as they were known to the compiler. These are the so-called Martyrologies, of which the most comprehensive is the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, compiled in the middle of the fifth century in the North of Italy, probably at Aquileia. It incorporated several smaller local lists and forms the basis of all the later martyrologies of the Western Church.

The veneration of the martyrs, finally, contributed in a particular manner to the development of pilgrimages. Already from the fourth century numbers of the faithful, either singly or in groups, travelled long distances in order to visit the tombs of the martyrs and implore their intercession. In the East there were several famous places of pilgrimages: the sepulchres of St. Menas in Egypt, of the Apostle St. John at Ephesus, of St. Thecla near Seleucia and others. In the West, Rome was the "Holy City" because more tombs of great and famous martyrs were to be found here than in any other town in Christendom. From the fifth century on it became the goal of countless pious pilgrims from all parts of the Western hemisphere, in particular from the newly-established kingdoms of the North, where Christian missionaries were working among the Teutonic races. From the territory of the Franks, from the Christian

districts of Germany, from England and Ireland, pious pilgrims came to Rome year by year during the sixth and seventh centuries to pray at the tomb of the martyrs and place themselves under the protection of these mighty patrons. Among these northern peoples bishops and abbots, princes and nobles vied with each other in trying to obtain from Rome church requisites, liturgical books, and above all relics of Roman martyrs to enshrine in their churches at home. In this way the pilgrimage contributed not only to the further propagation of the liturgical cultus of the Roman martyrs, but also to the diffusion of liturgical books and of the Roman liturgy in all its forms. Great indeed was the impetus which these pilgrimages to Rome gave, during the early Middle Ages, to religion and culture in the newly-converted kingdoms of the North.

We have seen how the veneration of the martyrs contributed in many and various directions to the development of the religious life of the Christian peoples and of the liturgy of the Church. We have seen also that it is a form of worship deeply rooted in Christian soil, how it sprang from purely Christian conceptions, assumed from the beginning of the second century distinct and outward forms, which from that time have been retained in the Catholic Church, and received in the definition of the Council of Trent an authoritative dogmatic confirmation.

HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. J. O. MORGAN, D.D., Ph.D., L.S.S.

It is worth noting that there is abundant matter, though somewhat overlapping, contained in these five homilies for an "Evening Series" on REAL RELIGION—THE LOVE OF GOD AND MAN (Mt. xxii. 36) distributed thus:—

Fifth Sunday After Easter. *The Essence of Religion—Love.* "Religion before God . . . is this," James i. 27.

Whit Sunday. *I Must Love God.* "This is the greatest and the first commandment," Mt. xxii. 38.

Trinity Sunday. *Why I Must Love God.* "He that is mighty hath done great things to me," Lk. i. 49.

Sunday Within the Octave of Ascension. *I must Love My Neighbour.* "Before all things have a constant mutual charity," I Peter iv. 8.

Sunday Within the Octave of Corpus Christi. *Why I Must Love My Neighbour.* "All the law is fulfilled in one word," Gal. v. 14.

Fifth Sunday after Easter (May 1st).

Epistle. (James i. 22-27.)

This Epistle is particularly apposite to our own times. The Apostle, while giving here a brief statement of the essence of the Christian Life, is writing for the edification of a people to whom economic hardships were proving a trial of Faith and a cause of class-hatred.

He is addressing words of encouragement to Judeo-Christians, who are the victims of economic circumstances, the poor, in fact, straitened by the manœuvres of unscrupulous rich (ii. 6, 15-17; v. 4). Their tribulations are the cause of the languishing of their faith (ii. 14); of hatred and resentment (ii. 7); of discord (iv. 1); of back-biting and sins of the tongue and the neglect of prayer (v. 13).

But, says the Apostle, these trials are really matter for joy (cf. Matt. xix. 19), since faith proved by tribulation brings constancy and perseverance (i. 3) and perseverance brings perfection (4). If you lack, however, that true Christian Wisdom which discerns the hand of God in tribulation, then pray for it (5), but pray with perseverance and an undivided purpose (8). Tribulations are, in fact, blessings (cf. the Beatitudes, Matt. v. 3). Through them we win to glory (12). Even so, do not blame God for the evils that afflict you: He is the cause of nothing but good (13-19). The proof? Why, He freely begot us, made

us His sons (Rom. viii. 15), the "first-fruits"—in your case—of the New Dispensation (Rom. xi. 16), by the preaching of the Gospel, the "Word of Truth" (18).

Give ear then readily to this word of truth, but be slow (the Apostle adapts a proverb of Prov. xiii. 3) in setting yourself up to expound it and equally slow in condemning interpretations of it in actual fact other than your own. It is from this that come your lack of charity, your hatreds, your calumnies and detractions (iii. 14-16). Remember that anger and resentment do not work for justification in the sight of God. Cleanse yourselves, therefore, of all this ugly contamination of malice, which is the cause of many sins. Be meek and hearken to the word of truth that is implanted in your hearts. It is in the word of truth that lies your salvation.

It is not enough, though, just to listen. If you think that, you deceive yourselves. You must put the teaching of the Gospel into practice. It can avail you not at all to listen and do nothing (Rom. ii. 13). You would be just like a man who scrutinizes himself in a mirror—for the word is the mirror of perfection—and then goes away forgetting what he is really like; since in that mirror of perfection you can see what *manner of man* you are, disfigured and distorted with malice. You must, indeed, examine this mirror of perfection and see how you are reflected in it, but do not forget—act according to what you have seen of yourself in that mirror. Be constant, too, in applying the lesson of your scrutinies, for this mirror, in which you have seen what you should be, is the Gospel truth, the "perfect law of liberty," the law which brings perfection, freeing you from the bondage of sin to make you the sons of God (cf. v. 18 with Gal. iv. 4). If thus you persevere and do not "go your way," you will be rewarded, not for your hearing, but for your "doing" of the word of truth by grace here and hereafter glory.

How do they differ, the "hearer" and the "doer"? The "hearer of the word" puts no bridle on his tongue, he lets it run riot in calumny and detraction (iii. 9, 14; iv. 11 seq.), and that is just where he deceives himself like the man who forgot his own appearance. He may indeed have some reverence for God—he deems himself "religious," having listened to the word. That will not suffice however. Religion certainly does imply reverence for God, but it also involves regard for our neighbour.

This then is real religion, religion sincere and unblemished, in the sight of God, the Father of us all: to exercise the works of mercy, especially towards the most needy, the orphan and the widow (Job xxix. 11-13), and to keep oneself uncontaminated, aloof from the conduct and the maxims of the world (II Pet. i. 4).

Real religion, therefore, is not barren, sterile and inactive. It is faith that is fruitful through charity. Real religion is, not hearing good things, but doing good things for the love of God and your neighbour. *But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?* (ii. 20).

Sunday Within the Octave of the Ascension (May 8th).

Epistle. (I Peter iv. 7-11.)

St. Peter, though addressing a different audience from that of St. James, probably the Ethnico-christians of Asia Minor, delivers a message that is both parallel with, and complementary to, the Epistle of last Sunday. He, too, has words of encouragement, not indeed for poor oppressed by the rich, but for Christians persecuted by the enemies of Christ. Like St. James, St. Peter warns his hearers neither to lose faith nor to allow themselves to be influenced by the conduct of their adversaries. They are to strive for sanctity, which manifests itself above all else in the exercise of charity.

As Christ, he says, died in the flesh upon the Cross for sin, so too must you die in the flesh to sin; since he that has *crucified his flesh with its concupiscences* (Gal. v. 24; Rom. vi. 3-13) is dead to sin and lives but for God. Do not, therefore, permit yourselves to be influenced by the example, nor affected by the scorn, of the pagans. Surely you lived long enough before your conversion according to their maxims. Remember that even the pagans, who scorn you because you do not imitate them, will have to render an account for everything. The moment when they will have to render that account draws near. Christ will judge all men, the living and the dead, yes, even the pagans (the *dead*, possibly, however, an allusion to iii. 19-20), for the Gospel was preached to them for their conversion (Augustine, Ep. clxiv.). The end of all things, after which comes the judgment, is at hand. The coming of Christ to the particular judgment is as near, as far as you and the pagans are concerned, as His coming to the General Judgment (II Peter iii. 8). *Watch ye therefore because you know not what hour your Lord will come* (Matt. xxiv. 42).

Be prudent then; act as men who realize what they are about. Be sober, not carried away by unhealthy excitements and self-indulgence; free, therefore, and prepared, for the serious work of prayer (Luke xxi. 34). Above all, be fervent, unremitting, in the exercise of the charity you already bear each other. The love of your neighbour for the love of God will wipe away your many sins; much will be forgiven you if only you will love much (Luke viii. 47).

This fervent love of your neighbour will induce you to practise ungrudging hospitality (Rom. xii. 13) with no thought of repining at expense or domestic upset. In the stranger, who seeks your bounty, you will discern your, and his, Elder Brother, Jesus Christ (Matt. xxv. 42).

Your charity will reveal itself, too, in the exercise of any faculties (not necessarily the *charismata* of Rom. xii.) you may possess for public service. You are only stewards, entrusted with the many and varied gifts of God, for the service of God and of your neighbour. If, for example, you have the talent

of preaching, of exhorting, or if you merely speak giving *reason of that hope that is within you* (iii. 15), let your words be as the oracles of God, pronounced, that is, with reverence, sincerity and charity as befits the employment of a gift given by God to your stewardship. Or again, if you are called to minister to the sick and the poor, let it be apparent from your humble manner and from your solicitude that you realize you have received the power to serve your neighbour from God.

After all, you are not the masters of these gifts from God; you are only stewards with a duty to administer them. Do not bury your talents therefore. Use them for the sake of God and your neighbour, but in their use do not show yourself arrogant and proud as if they were your very own. Realize that you received them from God. Realize that they have only been entrusted to you and that God will require an account of your stewardship. Then so act that this your realization is made clearly manifest.

Let the motive of your charitable actions be the glory of God. *So let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven* (Matt. v. 16). Thus will your good deeds redound, through Jesus Christ your Mediator, to the honour of God, whose is all glory and domination (He is the Lord and Master of all) for ever and ever. Amen.

Whit Sunday (May 15th).

Epistle. (Acts ii. 1-12).

On the Day of Pentecost, Peter with the Apostles and the disciples, to the number of about 120, were gathered together in the Cenacle, when, according to the "promise of the Father," the Holy Ghost descended upon them. His coming was heralded by two supernatural phenomena, one of hearing and one of sight, a divine "sacrament," outward signs of the inward happening.

The house reverberated to a sound like a great and rushing wind descending from on high. It signalled the advent of the Holy Ghost, for in the Old Testament the Presence of God (II Kings v. 24; III Kings xix. 11, etc.), and in the New the operation of the Spirit (John iii. 8) is symbolized by the wind. Along with the sound they became conscious of a phenomenon like to fire, which, dividing into flaming tongues, descended singly upon each present. It was the outward sign of the incoming of the Holy Spirit. Fire is the symbol of the Power and Presence of God (Ex. iii. 2; Mal. iii. 2) as well as of purification and sanctification (Ez. i. 13; Is. iv. 4). It was the Baptism of Fire which the Baptist had foretold (Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 16).

It is not readily apparent what was the precise purpose of this effusion of the Spirit: the Apostles had already "received the Holy Ghost" (Jn. xx. 22). It is not therefore, it would appear, the plenitude of sanctifying grace, but rather a special

gift, a gift of tongues (the flaming tongues are surely significant), a divine inspiration perhaps like the prophets'.

The immediate effect is evident. They began to speak, and "to speak oracles," (*ἀποφθέγγεσθαι*) under the control of the Holy Ghost in languages "other" than their own.

Meanwhile a crowd of pious Jews, drawn by the Pentecostal celebrations from the whole of the Diaspora, excited and attracted by the noise of the mighty wind, had centred upon the house. The Apostles and disciples, leaving the Cenacle to go to the Temple to thank God—it was the hour of prayer (v. 15)—encounter the multitude, who heard them, each in his own tongue, extolling the wonders of God.

It is possible that this gift of tongues, a faculty to speak, or to be understood, in "divers tongues," was bestowed on the Apostles to facilitate their mission as *witnesses to Christ even to the uttermost ends of the earth* (Acts i. 8). This is the interpretation of many of the Fathers and easily lends itself to a sermon on the Church, whose miracle to-day, the opposite of Pentecost, is to make men of many tongues speak the one tongue of Faith.

It appears more probable, however, that it was the *glossolalia*, the charisma given in the early Church, not for preaching to men, but for rendering praise to God (Acts xi. 15; I Cor. xiv. 2). It is significant that St. Peter, e.g., had no infused knowledge of Greek—he had an interpreter, Mark. It would appear, moreover, that it was given to all the disciples; they give vent to it even in the Cenacle; the crowd hear them extolling the "wonders of God" and some of them—a significant detail—think them drunk. It would appear, then, that the Apostles and disciples, ecstatic, were rhapsodizing, chanting the praises of God in the tongues of the Diaspora. This would seem as strange a bedlam to some at least of the bystanders as did the *glossolalia* to the pagan Corinthians (I Cor. xiv. 23).

It would appear, then, that the first manifestation of the Infant Church in public was not preaching God; it was praising God. It was the praising of God that gave occasion to the first official preaching of the Church.

The glory of God is our primary end. It is the purpose of the Church; it is the purpose of existence.

Praise the Lord, O my soul: in my life I will praise the Lord: I will sing to my God as long as I shall be (Ps. cxlv. 1). In my life I will praise the Lord as a member of His Church by participating in all acts of public worship and by fidelity in my private duties as one fully conscious of this my first and imperative obligation. I will give Him a *rationabile obsequium*. Appreciation which is not genuine, praise which is not sincere, is not worth having. I will not be of that *people who praise Him with their lips but their heart is far from Him* (Matt. xv. 8). I will put my heart and soul into it. I will present my *body a living sacrifice* (Rom. xii. 1). I will live for God, which is

harder sometimes than dying for God. I will love Him with my whole heart and with my whole soul and with my whole mind and with my whole strength (Matt. xxii. 36).

Veni Sancte Spiritus, reple tuorum corda fidelium et Tui amoris in eis ignem accende. This is the greatest and the first commandment (Matt. xxii. 38) that I should love God. I will praise Him in my life *propter magnam gloriam suam*. If hero-worship be the least selfish form of admiration, I will make God my Hero. If imitation be the sincerest form of appreciation, I will imitate Him. According to the bidding of my Master, I will strive to be as perfect as my Heavenly Father is perfect (Matt. v. 48). To be as good as God. . . ! But then, the most perfect praise that I can give Him, the best way in which I can glorify Him, is by the splendour of my own good life (Matt. v. 16).

I will sing to my God as long as I shall be, and that is forever hereafter in the bliss of Heaven, when the sole purpose of my existence shall be achieved and I am myself absorbed in the glory of God.

Laudamus Te. Benedicimus Te. Glorificamus Te.

Trinity Sunday (May 22nd).

Epistle. (Rom. xi. 33-36.)

The unfathomable abyss of the riches of God!

His resources and His Power are inexhaustible as are His Goodness and His Mercy (Rom. x. 12; Eph. iii. 8; Philipp. iv. 19). His Wisdom, through which He exercises His divine Providence disposing all things according to His eternal ends, is as boundless as His Knowledge, by which He knows and chooses the means that work sweetly but surely in the execution of His Providence. His ways are not our ways; His judgments are not ours. *Therefore He hath mercy on whom He will. And whom He will He hardeneth* (Rom. ix. 18). *O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to Him that formed it: why hast Thou made me thus?* (Rom. ix. 20).

No man could ever fathom the Knowledge of God to understand His designs. No man could ever penetrate the Wisdom of God in the shaping of His designs (Is. xl. 13). No man, nobody, nothing, could ever give God anything and place Him thus under obligation.

He made all things out of nothing. Through Him all things are conserved in being, governed by Him, working to the fulfilment of His divine scheme. For Himself therefore, as their final end, were all things made. All creation exists for His glory: then to Him let all creation render the glory that is His.

Of ourselves we are nothing. He created us. He sustains us in being. He alone gives the means to achieve our final end. All life, supernatural as well as natural, lies within the hollow of His hand. We depend utterly and completely on Him here and hereafter. But He is all-powerful. He is all-knowing. He

is all-wise. He is working through, and in, the whole universe as He is working through, and in, the smallest microcosm. Nothing can take Him unawares. Nothing can thwart His Will. He is turning all things, even the smallest detail of existence, to account. He is the Master-craftsman. "The best-laid schemes of mice and men gang oft agley"; God's plans can never fall short. He provides all things; He makes provision for all things. He is *Providence*.

It follows, then, that we must have the most utter and invincible confidence in the divine Providence, which is God Himself. *God is faithful, who will strengthen you and keep you from evil* (II Thess. iii. 3).

Be not solicitous then (Matt. vi. 28). Nor be querulous and impatient. Whatever happens is for the best—God's best. Everything is a unit of His Scheme; everything is part and parcel of His Providence. Sorrow and pain, joy and gladness, are woof and warp interwoven by the same divine Weaver. Why question Him? *Why reply against Him? Is the hand of the Lord unable?* (Num. xi. 23). *If you then being evil know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father from heaven . . . ?* (Luke xi. 13).

Be resigned then to His Will. You can never escape the Hound of Heaven, but His inevitable pursuit is for mercy and not for destruction. We are the sons of God, cradled in the hands of a loving Father. *Behold what manner of charity the Father hath bestowed on us that we should . . . be the sons of God* (I John iii. 1). *God is Love* (I John ii. 8). His Providence is Love. Then give love for Love. *My son, pleads the Creator with His creature, give me thy heart and let thy eyes keep my ways* (Prov. xxiii. 26). Give God your hearts, give Him your love—it is the first and greatest commandment—and, loving God, glorify Him. *My soul doth magnify the Lord and my spirit hath rejoiced in God, my Saviour. . . . Because He that is mighty hath done great things to me: and holy is His Name* (Luke i. 46).

Sunday Within the Octave of Corpus Christi (May 29th).

Epistle. (I John iii. 3, 13-18).

Do not wonder, says the Apostle, that worldly men hate you if you follow Christ. It is for the same reason that Cain hated Abel—*because his own works were wicked and his brother's just* (v. 12). The world hates you (and let this be your consolation!) because you have passed from the death of sin to the life of grace (Jn. v. 24). You have assurance of this, as far as man can have assurance of sanctification in this life, through the mutual charity you exercise among the brethren, since *he that loveth not his brother is not of God* (v. 10) and abides in the sin that leads to eternal death. Worse, he that hates his brother is like Cain, a murderer at heart (Mt. v. 21), and you know that no murderer possesses the grace of eternal life.

You must have charity, therefore, and you can discern the nature and the extent of the charity you must have from the example of Christ, your God. Just as He laid down His life for us, the willing *propitiation for our sins* (ii. 2), so must you be prepared, if their spiritual good demand it, to lay down your life for your brethren. *Greater love no man hath* (Jn. xv. 13). The breath of your body is as nothing to your own and your neighbour's soul. *For he that will save his life shall lose it: and he that shall lose his life for My sake shall find it* (Jn. xv. 25).

Moreover, if, urged by this divine example, you should be prepared to die for your neighbour, all the more should you be prepared to live for your neighbour. You must help him. If you have the means and you close both your heart and your pockets to the pleading of your neighbour's necessity, you have not that charity by which you love God for His own sake and your neighbour for God's. *For he that loveth not his brother whom he seeth, how can he love God Whom he seeth not?* (iv. 20).

Little children (you are all the children of the one family of God), do not let your love for your brother, who is your neighbour, stop short at mere words. Actions speak louder than words. *A new commandment I give you*, said Our Divine Lord, *that you love one another: as I have loved you that you also love one another*—and He died for us! *By this shall all men know that you are my disciples if you have love one for another*, He said—and men can never know that love unless you manifest it in deed (Jn. xii. 34, 35).

You have heard that it hath been said: Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thy enemy, but I say unto you: Love your enemies: do good to them that hate you and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you (Mt. v. 44 seq.). Do not forget, either, that you pray God daily to treat you as you treat others. Our Father, Who art in heaven, you say, forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us.

All the law is fulfilled in one word: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself (Gal. v. 14). How well we love ourselves! How kind, how blind to our own faults, how indulgent to our own shortcomings! That is the way we should love our neighbour. We must wish well to everybody, think well of everybody, do well to everybody—even our enemy! He too is our neighbour: he is our brother.

We are all the members of the one great divine family. *For you are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. . . . There is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free. . . . For ye are all one in Christ Jesus* (Rom. x. 12; Gal. iii. 26).

What you do, then, to your neighbour for good or ill you do to your Elder Brother, Jesus Christ. *Amen I say to you as long as you did it to one of these, my least brethren, you did it to Me* (Mt. xxv. 40).

MORAL CASES

BLESSED ASHES.

Pious customs exist in many places with regard to the ashes which, in a strictly liturgical observance, should be distributed only at the Mass on Ash Wednesday. For example, the faithful sometimes wish to take the blessed ashes home with them, to be given to a sick person; occasionally they expect the priest to visit the house with ashes for the same purpose; in many places the ceremony is observed on the first Sunday of Lent, in the Churches, since many are unable to be present on Wednesday. May these customs be tolerated? Far from causing any harm they serve a useful religious purpose, and it would seem they should be allowed to continue unless there is some law existing which prohibits them.

REPLY.

Official solutions of these *dubia* have been given at various times. In each case it is supposed that a pious custom is in possession, which is not justified by the rubrics of the Missal or by any authorized Ritual.

(1) S.C.R., June 9th, 1668, *Decreta Authentica*, n. 1367, "S.R.C. ad preces Parochi S.J. Baptistae Terrae Psychii Umbriaticen. Rossanen. Dioecesis, declaravit: Guardiano Minor. Observant. Reformat. non licere se conferre ad domus habitantium sub illius Parochia, eisque distribuere in iisdem domibus cineres die prima Quadragesimae, prout introduci exposuit."

(2) Benedict XIV Const. *Omnium Sollicitudinum*, September 12th, 1744, quoting Benedict XIII, "... mandantes ut Sanctae Ecclesiae consuetudo, pique ritus Cineres benedicendi, illisque Christianorum caput Cruce signandi, ad humanae infirmitatis memoriam recolendam, religiose servantur, tempore, ac modo ab Ecclesia praescripto, scilicet Feria quarta Cinerum, et non alias" (*Gasparri Fontes*, I, n. 348, page 843).

(3) S.C.R., May 7th, 1892, "Apud Christianos huius Archidioceseos Columbi Celani, a longo tempore usus invaluit sacros cineres Feria IV Cinerum juxta Ecclesiae Rituum benedictos, domi, ad instar cuiusdam sacramentalis adhibendos, secum afferendi. . . . An usus sacrorum cinerum supra descripti tolerari possit? Resp. Non esse interloquendum."

(4) S.C.R., June 30th, 1922 (*Decreta Authentica*, n. 4373). "Abhinc multis annis viget consuetudo, in nonnullis sive piarum domorum sive parocciarum ecclesiis, imponendi fidelibus, prima Dominica-Quadragesimae, Cineres praecedenti Feria IV benedictos. Sic enim omnes fideles recipiunt cineres. . . .

Potestne permitti talis usus. Resp. Affirmative in casu; dummodo Feria IV Cinerum ritus benedictionis et impositionis Cinerum expletus fuerit, juxta Missale Romanum, et Dominica prima in Quadragesima post expletam Missam aut extra Missam fiat impositio eorumdem Cinerum."

(5) S.C.R., February 1st, 1924 (*Decreta Authentica*, n. 4368), "Num eadem permissio (Cf. n. 4373) valeat etiam pro Oratoriis Piarum Unionum seu Congregationum, vel sacellis ruralibus, aliisque ubi peragantur exercitia pro opificibus, ut iidem omnes facilius Cineres recipiant et non careant hoc tam utili sacramentali? Resp. Affirmative, juxta prudeniam Ordinarii judicium in singulis casibus, servato tenore decreti n. 4373."

These documents are, in some respects, conflicting. The first one is almost universally quoted by the authors as an express prohibition of the practice of priests taking blessed ashes to private houses.¹ Yet, on examination, it rather appears that the decree implicitly approves the custom, for it was concerned with prohibiting a religious, in the Province of Naples, from performing this function within the confines of a certain parish. A writer in the *Ami du Clergé*, 1909, p. 784, adopts this interpretation and decides for the lawfulness of the practice. The second document is dealing with superstitious practices and, while reprobating the use of curious analogous rites, takes the occasion for recommending the accepted rites of the Church. If taken in its context it could be held that the non-liturgical use of blessed ashes is not expressly forbidden unless the practice becomes superstitious.² The third document undeniably favours the non-liturgical customs. "Non esse interloquendum" may mean that the custom is not to be interfered with,³ or that the Congregation declined to give an official decision.⁴ This decree is not included in the *Decreta Authentica* but is found in the earlier *Collectanea S.C. de Prop. Fide*. The last two replies are clear. The custom of distributing ashes on the first Sunday in Lent may be permitted in parish Churches and Chapels; also in other places, which are used for religious purposes, provided the permission of the Ordinary is obtained.

It is certain, therefore, that the custom of distributing ashes in churches not only "extra Missam" on Ash Wednesday as the authors commonly teach,⁵ but also *extra Missam* on the following Sunday, may lawfully be continued. Their distribution in other places used for religious purposes is lawful, provided the consent of the Ordinary is obtained. With regard to other uses, e.g., priestly visitation of houses, or allowing the faithful to take ashes home, I am personally inclined to regard them

¹ E.g., *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 1917, Vol. IX, p. 421; Ojetti, *Synopsis Rerum Moralium*, n. 1031.

² Thus *American Ecclesiastical Review*, XXIV, 1901, p. 424; XXVI, 1902, p. 461.

³ *I.E.R.*, loc. cit.

⁴ *A.E.R.*, XXIV, loc. cit.

⁵ De Herdt III, n. 20; *Ami du Clergé*, 1913, p. 480.

as unlawful. Nevertheless, these practices are not clearly and certainly forbidden. Any priest is free to adopt the solution given by the authorities I have mentioned. The *Ami du Clergé* decides that the priestly visitation of houses is lawful; the *American Ecclesiastical Review* and the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* decide that a priest may use his discretion in allowing the laity to take blessed ashes home with them as a sacramental. Neither of these practices is liturgically correct and they are liable to be abused, but if the customs exist it may be better to tolerate their continuance rather than upset the piety of the faithful. Common observation reveals that some of the most Catholic parts of Europe are not in the least observant of liturgical laws. The whole question is one of toleration of existing customs. If no such customs exist it is certainly wrong to introduce them.

E. J. MAHONEY.

FIRST COMMUNION.

A parish priest of my acquaintance insists on all the children in his parish making their first Communion in the parish Church and, if this cannot be secured, claims the right in all cases to judge their fitness. This sometimes causes friction between the parish priest and parents or teachers, and I have often wondered whether he is exceeding his powers in the matter.

REPLY.

Canon 854 §4 states: "De sufficienti puerorum dispositione ad primam communionem iudicium esto sacerdoti a confessionibus eorumque parentibus aut iis qui loco parentum sunt." This rule is a re-statement of *Quam Singulari*, n. iv, except that in the decree of Pius X the parent is mentioned before the confessor, a slight change which I think has no special significance. It is also the rule of the Roman Catechism (*Donovan's Translation*, II, iv, n. 61).

But §5 of the same Canon 854 deals with the position of the parish priest: "Parocho autem est officium advigilandi, etiam per examen, si opportunum prudenter iudicaverit, ne pueri ad sacram Synaxim accedant ante adeptum usum rationis vel sine sufficienti dispositione; itemque curandi ut usum rationis assecuti et sufficienter dispositi quamprimum hoc divino cibo reficiantur." There is clearly room for much difference of opinion, in applying these two sections of the Canon, unless they are very carefully interpreted.

One thing is fairly certain. Admission to first Communion is not a parochial right in the strict sense of "jus," in the sense that the administration of the last Sacraments, for example, is a parochial right. A decree of Propaganda, June 6th, 1839, recognized the existence of such a right, but this decree is not included in the *Collectanea* of 1907; the word "jus" is expressly omitted in the phrasing of this canon, nor is admission to first Communion enumerated amongst the other

parochial rights in Canon 462. Apart, therefore, from dioceses which have some local laws on the subject, the parish priest is exceeding his powers in demanding that all the children of the parish should make their first Communion solemnly in the parish Church. It is, indeed, most fitting and desirable that they should do so, and he can urge the practice as strongly as he pleases, but he cannot accuse persons of breaking any law or violating his rights, if they prefer to take their children elsewhere.

What then is the force of "officium" in Canon 854 and the equivalent obligations mentioned in Can. 1330. A distinction must be made between a "judgment" concerning the dispositions of the candidates and the "right" of administering Holy Communion to them. The parish priest has no "right" with regard to administering first Communion, but he has a "duty" of seeing that children make their first Communion at the right age and with the right dispositions. No particular difficulty arises when it is a question of urging dilatory parents and teachers to present the children who are of age. But what is the parish priest's position if a child is presented for first Communion, either in the parish Church or elsewhere, and the parish priest is assured by parents or teachers that it is properly disposed? He has the right to examine the child, but it is limited by the rather indeterminate phrases "opportunum" and "prudenter." Therefore, the authors are extremely cautious and guarded concerning the lawfulness of insisting on an examination. Thus (a) Capello: "non posse parochum repellere puerum quem sufficienter dispositum existimaverint parentes vel a fortiori confessarius, nisi forte habeat fundata motiva dubitandi (quod vix admitti seu supponi debet, ubi iudicium datum fuerit a confessario) de sufficienti dispositione. (*De Sacramentis*, I, §530. *Periodica*, XVI, 1917, p. 133.)

(b) *Collationes Brugenses*, 1922, p. 317: "caveat tamen (parochus) ne id (examen) faciat quia parentes eius consilium non exquisierunt, vel quia eum non monuerunt de instante prima communione pueri . . . si parentes vere christiani sunt, fidat parentum iudicio . . . si puer comitantibus parentibus ad sacram synaxim accedant, *importune* examen in his adjunctis exigeretur et *imprudenter* sacra communio denegaretur, nisi manifestum sit puerum huius sacramenti cognitione et gustu carere. Officium parochi non requirit ut ab omnibus pueris indiscriminatim huiusmodi examen exigatur, quod satis ex praedictis compertum est. . . . Paucis verbis, parentes judicant de idoneitate prolis, parochus vero prospicit de adimplentione legis et bono gregis.

(c) Ferreres: "Huic officio parochi tunc locus esse debet, dum adsit prudens suspicio, ne parentes vel confessarius prudenter hac in re se gerant" (*Theologia Moralis*, II, §423).

The whole doctrine is simply a particular application of the general principle that the Sacraments are to be given to those who seek them reasonably.

E. J. M.

APPLICATIO MISSAE RATIONE PRECEPTI.

In a certain diocese there exists a fixed equal stipend for the Celebrant, Deacon and Subdeacon of a solemn Requiem Mass. It is understood by the faithful that the celebrant will apply the Mass for the soul of the deceased. In addition, an episcopal law requires the Deacon and Subdeacon, who are almost always in sacerdotal orders, to say a private Requiem Mass for the soul of the deceased. What exactly is the nature of the obligation arising from this episcopal precept?

REPLY.

I. The obligation arises directly and of its nature from the duty of obedience to ecclesiastical authority. It cannot be denied that the Ordinary has the right of imposing an obligation of this kind; it is merely an extension of the principle by which the Church requires parish priests and others to offer Mass "pro populo" on certain days. The objection that the Church cannot command an internal act is met by rejoining that this act is not purely "internal" but "mixed," and the authors all recognize that the Bishops have the power of adding to the ordinary obligations of the common law of the Church, for some special reason and in special circumstances. It is also recognized that, in practice, this power is rarely used. (Gasparri *De Eucharistia*, Vol. I, §638; Cappello *De Sacramentis*, §696; *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, XIX, 1922, p. 308.) But there cannot be any reasonable doubt that the right exists, in spite of the various arguments that can be adduced against it. These arguments are well presented and answered in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, XIX, 1922, p. 533. If it is objected that the right is liable to be abused, the same objection applies to every use of authority on the part of ecclesiastical and other superiors. The subject can seek redress by any lawful means. Moreover, all the authors are careful to note that this particular episcopal power should be used sparingly, lest the clergy suffer an unjust diminution of their rightful dues. "Verum episcopus sobrie omnino procedere debet in injungendis his oneribus, maxime si sacerdotes tenui salario fruuntur, ne eos privet facultate pro sustentatione ex stipendiis Missarum complementum quaerendi" (*Apollinaris*, III, 1930, p. 313).

II. In the circumstances of this case it is necessary to add that, indirectly, an obligation "ex justitia" might sometimes arise. The donors of the triple stipendium for a solemn Mass may be aware of the diocesan law and may make their offering precisely because they desire three Masses to be said.

E. J. M.

THE CONFESSOR AND BIRTH CONTROL.

The reply on this subject in the February number of the REVIEW (page 143) states that the confessor is liable to proceedings *contra sollicitantes*. Is this not an exaggeration

seeing that his action is due to ignorance and is not accompanied by any formal guilt?

REPLY.

Let us, for the sake of brevity, dismiss the subject of ignorance on the part of a confessor. *Peccat ignorans*: "quicumque negligit habere, vel facere id, quod tenetur habere, vel facere, peccat peccato omissionis; unde propter negligentiam ignorantia eorum, quae aliquis scire tenetur, est peccatum" (I-II, q. 76, art. 2).

The legislation of Benedict XIV, contained in Documentum V at the end of the Code, is primarily concerned with the confessor who is formally guilty of one of the gravest sins possible for him to commit. But its terms cover other lapses which, if you like, are nothing more than material sin. Counsel which induces a penitent to commit sins of unchastity is technically the offence contemplated by the law. From the point of view of the confessor's own conscience it is a matter between himself and God. But from the point of view of the common good of souls, who are being grievously misled, it is a matter which calls for the intervention of ecclesiastical authority. Thus, an answer of the Sacred Penitentiary, September 2nd, 1904,¹ with regard to a confessor who misdirected a married person concerning the malice of solitary sin, was to the effect that he was to be denounced. From the wording of this document it is clear that the confessor was ignorant, not vicious. The case considered in last month's issue is, I suppose, on the border line, but it is indubitably true that he is *liable* to the procedure. He would not necessarily undergo any of the severe penalties provided in the law, but the canonical procedure would offer an opportunity of dispelling his ignorance.

E. J. M.

¹ De Smet: *De Absolutione Complicis et Sollicitatione*, §205. Cf. also p. 40, n.4.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. GEORGE D. SMITH, Ph.D., D.D.

Through the enterprise of the house of Sheed & Ward the monumental work of Père L. de Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ*, is being given to us in English, translated by Dom Basil Whelan and Ada Lane.¹ The first volume (containing Parts 1 and 2 of the original) appeared in 1930, before the birth of the CLERGY REVIEW; the second volume (containing Parts 3 and 4) has just been published, while the third, and last, is promised late in the present year. I suppose that all who read the author's masterly article *Jésus Christ* in the *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique* (1914) hoped that a study so complete and so surpassing in excellence any which had hitherto appeared on the subject might shortly be given to the public in a separate volume. But the learned Jesuit was not content with what he regarded as little more than an outline, and it was not until 1927, after he had devoted some fourteen years to an intensive critical examination of the historical sources of the life of Christ, that he considered his work to be complete. In June, 1927, he died, deprived thus of the consolation of seeing published what Père Lebreton, in introducing the work, truly calls "the fruit of the labour of a whole lifetime."

The first volume, dealing as it does with the sources for the history of Christ, and describing the environment, political, social and intellectual, in which He lived and preached is, of course, concerned chiefly with matters biblical, and has received from Scriptural experts the warm commendation which it undoubtedly deserves. But the theologian will find here, not merely a full and satisfying authentication of one of the sources of revelation, but also a striking embodiment of those qualities which make for true scholarship: patience in research, discrimination in the sifting of material, soberness of judgment, and above all a scrupulous fair-mindedness which shows itself in generous appreciation accorded to the work of scholars who do not share the writer's convictions.

It is in the second volume, however, published at the end of February, that the theologian will find matters dealt with which touch his subject more closely. Nowhere have I seen the scriptural proof of the divinity of Christ set out so fully or so forcibly as in the section of this volume entitled "The Witness of Jesus," while the chapter on "The Problem of Jesus" is quite beyond praise. After a short section dealing with Christ as seen from without," that is, by pagans, Jews and Mohammedans, Père

¹ Sheed & Ward. Vol. I, 10s. 6d.; Vol. II, 12s. 6d.

de Grandmaison sets out to relate the dolorous history of non-Catholic Christology since the time of the Reformation. "The author of the latter," he writes, "with Luther at their head, would have reckoned it criminal to efface from their creed, or even to cast doubt upon, the dogmas dealing with the divinity of Christ; yet the fact remains that their contempt for scholastic theology, coupled with their impatience of any authoritative control, and above all the rôle which they ultimately assigned to subjective religious experience, sanctioned the discussion and subsequent disintegration of the whole body of Christian dogma."² How these influences, together with pagan humanism, and the naturalism which is its logical outcome, were responsible, outside the Catholic Church, for the gradual deformation of the figure of the Word Incarnate, is shown in the history of eighteenth century rationalism, of Liberal Protestantism, and of Rationalism, and Modernism as they exist at the present day. "It is with sadness," writes the author, as he sums up the conclusions of modern Protestant theologians, "that we place on record conclusions so foreign to genuine Christianity."³

The conclusion of the author cannot but be shared by his readers, that only the formula of Chalcedon takes account of all the elements in the picture of Christ which the Gospels present: and this is admitted by Professor Bethune Baker in the following statement: "No one who accepts as history in the ordinary sense of the word the implications of the fourth Gospel (or even of all the other Gospels) as to our Lord's consciousness during His life on earth need trouble himself about any restatement of the traditional doctrine. If these are the facts of our Lord's life, and he bases his doctrine on the facts, he is not likely to arrive at any better co-ordination than the orthodox Christology offers."⁴

Another important French work recently made accessible to English readers is the Abbé Anger's *Le corps Mystique*, which appears in the translation of the Rev. John J. Burke under the title: *The Doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ*.⁵ Fr. Bellanti, in the Foreword which he contributes to the volume, calls it "a veritable mine of information for the student," a judgment which all who have read the book must endorse. Not a single item of Catholic doctrine but finds its place in this all-embracing synthesis: the Redemption, Grace, the earthly life of Christ, the Trinity, the Sacraments, the Church, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Mariology, the principles of morality, and the rest, all is explained in its relation to this fundamental Christian truth, that the faithful are united with Christ in a vital organism, which is His body and His fullness. Since the publication of *Mysterium Fidei* I have seen no work which so

² p. 271.

³ p. 321.

⁴ p. 323.

⁵ Longmans, 1932; 12s. 6d.

clearly manifests the organic unity of Catholic teaching. It was a pity, by the way, though it was perhaps natural, in view of the prominence given by Père de la Taille to his own view concerning the essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass, that the majority of those who noticed his work should have concentrated their attention, favourable or otherwise, upon this one thesis. It was a pity, because the fierce limelight thus thrown upon a few chapters of the book left much of his work which is invaluable in an unmerited oblivion, especially the admirable synthesis of Eucharistic doctrine which—even independently of controverted points—the *Mysterium Fidei* presents. The Abbé Anger—who expresses his great indebtedness to Père de la Taille—has not failed to give to the Eucharist that central place in Catholic doctrine which it has always held in Catholic life and practice; in particular by bringing forth from the obscurity to which it had been relegated by many dogmatic text-books the teaching of St. Thomas on the necessity—at least by desire—of the Eucharist for salvation.

And yet—admirable though it is, one cannot but share the regret of the author that he had not been “able to recast, to reconsider in some measure, at least, the whole work.” There is need for the pruning-knife. As the book stands, it is so exhaustive as to be exhausting, containing as it does a mass of detail which is irrelevant to the author’s main thesis. Thus, for example, in dealing with the Sacrament of Penance he gives a great deal of information about the acts of the penitent which seems out of place in a book of this kind, while one looks in vain for some treatment of the corporate significance of reconciliation by Penance, which Tertullian, St. Ambrose and St. Augustine have emphasized for us. This lack of proportion, small blemish though it is, is to be regretted, for it prevents what is really a “mine of information for students” from being also “a truly great book.”

The two latest collections of Papers read at the Cambridge Summer School of Catholic Studies deal with subjects which, by their very amplitude, might well have appalled those whose duty it was to apportion them among the lecturers. The subject for 1930 was “God”; for 1931 it was “Man.” Yet, despite the fact that there were only ten lectures on God,⁶ for the most part each of an hour’s duration, the amount of ground covered is surprising. After an admirable introductory lecture by Fr. MacGillivray, in which the sources and method of the study of God are explained, the lecturers successively deal with the proofs of the existence of God, the Divine Attributes, the Divine Immanence and God’s distinction from the Universe, the Beatific Vision, the Divine Knowledge and Love, the Problem of Evil, etc. The subject-matter is difficult and profound, and so the volume does not make light reading, but even those who are not theologians, if they are prepared to do some serious thinking, will find here a fairly complete treatise of natural

⁶ *God*. Sheed & Ward, 1931; 7s. 6d.

theology suited to their requirements. The doctrine of the Trinity, and other truths concerning God which we know only from revelation, will form the subject of future Summer Schools.

Hardly less vast, if considered in its various ramifications, is the subject chosen for 1931, and yet here, too, hardly anything of vital importance about "Man" has been omitted. Dom Raphael Williams treats profoundly a profound subject, that of the immateriality and immortality of the human soul; Fr. Reys explains very concisely and accurately the substantial unity of man, with special reference to his vegetal and animal life, while man's intellectual and volitional activities are dealt with very capably by Fr. Leycester King, S.J. A lecture on the Moral Law and Freedom by Dr. Fulton Sheen completes the treatment of man's nature. Three lectures are then devoted to the subject of Creation, Fr. Hugh Pope explaining the meaning of the term, and Dr. Messenger and Dr. Flynn dealing, from somewhat different standpoints, with the much discussed question of Evolution. The remaining lectures, by Dom Anscar Vonier, Dr. Arendzen, Dr. Smith and Archbishop Goodier, treat of the elevation of man to the supernatural order, of his fall, of original sin and its effects, and of the Redemption.

As theological synopses for the laity—and for those of the clergy, too, who have little leisure for a profounder study—these collections are invaluable.

II. PHILOSOPHY.

BY FR. KIERAN, O.M.Cap.

An admirable philosophical symposium, published a few years ago,⁶ goes to show that the interest in Thomistic philosophy aroused in recent years is not limited to Scholastic circles. Dr. Zyburas has given us a good insight into the waking life of this new interest, and we are reminded of the truth of the words of M. E. Gilson: "The thirteenth century is in us and we cannot rid ourselves of it by denying it any more than a man can deliberately detach himself from his past by merely forgetting that he has a past."

In this symposium of international dimensions the opinions of non-scholastic philosophies are collected: their reactions to scholasticism are registered. In general, it is obvious that their reactions are positive and sympathetic, and are valuable, if only to indicate very strikingly their own philosophical needs. From such intellectual centres as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Toronto, Oxford, Edinburgh, Birmingham and Manchester the wish has been expressed that modern thinkers are really anxious to know more about scholastic philosophy.

In the second portion of the book something is done towards

⁶ *Man*. Sheed & Ward, 1932; 75. 6d.

⁸ Zyburas: *Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism*. Herder.

meeting this desire: prominent neo-Scholastics are allowed to present the case for their system. Dr. Grabmann of Munich gives an illuminating paper on the *Nature and Problems of the New Scholasticism in the Light of History*; Professor Gény, S.J., late of the Gregorian University, writes on *Scholastic Philosophy and Modern Mentality*, and emphasizes the fact that as a philosophy Idealism has become sterile, "because since the time of Descartes has issued from it the false interpretation of the immanence of thought." He goes on to say that: "The very excesses of Idealism have produced a violent reaction in England and still more in the United States, due no doubt to the practical and realistic sense of the race." A good insight into neo-realistic reactions both in England and America is given by Dr. Kremer. There are other essays by Professor Olgiati of Milan, Fr. Millar of Fordham, and J. H. Ryan of the Catholic University of Washington. Though not very recent, this symposium will prove very valuable to those readers of the CLERGY REVIEW who are anxious to keep up with the march in modern thought. It will help to show that the knowledge once obtained is not so very antiquated after all, seeing that the moderns have begun to frequent the Schools.

On a line with the Zybura research for general view-points is an excellent book by Dr. Grabmann,⁹ translated by Dr. Michel, O.S.B. This book has to do with the philosophy of Saint Thomas himself. Like that of Dr. Zybura it may be described as having left the cradle also, since it was published some time ago. But on English book-shelves it is likely to be a "book of little showing." In the German, however, it has reached its fifth edition and its English version deserves a like success. For those who are anxious to obtain a "close up" view of St. Thomas, without much effort, it can scarcely be excelled. The first portion of the book gives us the personality of the Saint, and in the second the synthesis of his philosophy is expounded. The chapter on St. Thomas as a scholar makes admirable spiritual reading. The central idea emphasized by Dr. Grabmann is that the thought of St. Thomas is essentially theo-centric. This is "the reason and source of the peculiar genius of his writings. In its light we can best understand the objectivity, the dispassionateness, the limpid clarity, the modesty and moderation, the peace and truth that breathe from his works."

The tireless hand of the same author gives us another work dealing with St. Thomas.¹⁰ It is an Introduction to the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas, translated by Dr. Zybura. "This is not," the translator reminds us, "a mere abstract or an apology of Thomism. It is a scientific, historical, and practical treatise, enabling us to realize what the *theologica Summa* is, to appraise it at its true value and to study it with the greatest profit." We are given the historical settings of the *Summa*.

⁹ Grabmann: *Thomas Aquinas: His Thought and Personality*. Longmans.

¹⁰ Grabmann: *Introduction to the Theological Summa of St. Thomas*. English Translation by Dr. Zybura. Herder & Co.

as well as its aim, method and divisions. The aim of the *Summa* is simple, as St. Thomas indicates in his Prologue, "because the master of Catholic truth ought not only to teach the proficient but also to instruct beginners (according to the Apostle: 'As unto little ones in Christ, I gave you milk to drink and not meat,' I Cor. iii. 1, 2), we purpose in this book to treat whatever belongs to the Christian religion in such a way as may tend to the instruction of beginners." Hence the "good Brother Thomas" gives this manual to the "novitii sacrae doctrinae," and Dr. Grabmann in the present work throws valuable light on this text-book of the thirteenth century. The translator hopes that his English version of the German edition will meet with a welcome, and the best welcome that can be offered is to buy and read it.

The growing interest in St. Thomas, it might have been hoped, would have served to draw attention to the Teacher of St. Thomas, Albertus Magnus. But somehow the greatness of Aquinas seems to have dimmed the light of Albert. Just recently, however, things have been moving quickly in favour of the Teacher. On December 16th, 1931, Blessed Albert was declared Saint by Papal Bull, and not only Saint but Doctor of the Universal Church. And this undoubtedly helps to focus attention on St. Albert. The editors of the *Revue Thomiste*¹¹ have devoted one entire number to Albertus Magnus. A wealth of material will be found between its covers. The life and teachings of the Saint are written up, and an excellent bibliography, covering forty pages, indicates the amount of matter already compiled on Albertus Magnus.

Those who have studied philosophy are always interested in the results of scientific investigation. In this respect a recent book by Abbé Moreux,¹² the director of the Observatory of Bourges, makes wide appeal. The English version is by Fr. Fitzsimons, O.M.I., and it carries a foreword by Dr. Corcoran, S.J. The author discusses modern scientific problems in the light of philosophy, and touches on such problems as the Laws and Calculus of Probabilities, matter and energy, space and time: "a popular outline of philosophy in relation to scientific problems of to-day."

An American publication to hand, *The Report of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Franciscan Education Conference*,¹³ contains many interesting papers. The paper contributed by Dr. Longpré, O.F.M., deserves special mention. It is a contribution to the study of the Psychology of Duns Scotus—wherein the possibilities of this psychology are brilliantly indicated as well as its significance in the light of modern psychological research. The other papers,

¹¹ *Revue Thomiste* (Mars-Avril, 1931), *Le Bienheureux Albert le Grand*.

¹² Moreux: *Modern Science and the Truths Beyond*. Brown & Nolan, Dublin. 5s.

¹³ Published from the Capuchin College, Brookland, Washington, D.C.

for example, St. Augustine and the Franciscan School, and Freud's Psycho-Analytic Theory, are also characterized by careful and scholarly research. The latter contribution, taken in conjunction with the discussion that followed, reveals the fact that Freudian diagnosis is not always as innocent and harmless as that of the poet who sang :

A progressive young lady of Rheims
Had confessed some astonishing dreams,
And was justly annoyed when the great Dr. Freud
Said : " A surfeit of chocolate creams."

Modern interest is very much centred in the problems of psychology. It is not easy to keep *au courant* with the new developments in this science. The reader will be helped considerably by the work of Fr. Lindworsky, S.J.,¹⁴ which is furnished with an impartial criticism of current theories. In Germany it has reached its fourth edition. His explanation of human cognitive activities is founded on the knowledge of relations. " This concept gives the book its characteristic tone." The fourth section is devoted to a study of such practical questions as language, morals, art and religion, and the author's treatment will be found very instructive.

The most recent phase of psychological theory is that associated with the name Gestalt Psychology, and its eminent exponent Wolfgang Köhler, Ph.D., has published a work¹⁵ that is intended to give the general view-points of the system; the American edition of this work appeared a year before the English one. It may be said immediately that in regard to the old Associationist psychology Gestalt-Psychology is a step forward. It is a reaction against the mechanistic, mosaic and behaviouristic schools. In his opening chapters Dr. Köhler criticizes behaviourism and justly emphasizes that it is destructive both of physical science and introspective psychology. When introspective psychology and physical science have gone, what remains for investigation? The author then proceeds to discuss the " introspectionists." This is the weakest chapter of the book, since the author is wrestling with shadows rather than with realities. He spends much time in explaining away an introspection which is not introspection, a rather hopeless task. In point of fact the stick used by him against behaviourism can here be used against himself. Notwithstanding all he has to say against introspection, his whole book is full of its unconscious use. Gestalt psychology in its principle of dynamic self-distribution has found a counterpart for the dynamic tendencies in physical science, but vital activity as such does not seem as yet to have any part in the question of mental development. As a reaction against the older psychologies this book is new and beneficial, but it cannot pretend to put us in possession of a new solution of mental life that is entirely

¹⁴ Lindworsky : *Experimental Psychology*. Allen & Unwin.

¹⁵ Köhler : *Gestalt Psychology*. Bell & Sons, Ltd. 155.

adequate. The work is worth perusal as it is representative of a substantial movement in the psychological world of to-day.

Of interest for psychology also is the work of E. R. Jaensch on eidetic imagery.¹⁶ This book comes from the Marburg School. It deals with imagery under the aspect of "percept images." "The eidetic images are subjective visual phenomena which are found in many young people, but not so often amongst adults." They are not pathological, nor merely after-images, not memory-images. The characteristic of these eidetic images are presented by Dr. Jaensch and his school as they extend over the auditory, tactual and olfactory fields of consciousness. The author is further convinced of the importance of the phenomena in sociology, mythology, art, philosophy and pedagogy, and as a general conclusion he puts forward the view that after-images, eidetic images, memory-images give us three levels of memory.

What appears to be the weakest portion of the book is his answers to enquiries "as to the methods by which eidetic imagery can be discovered especially among school children." "First of all," he writes, "we have to take care that the individuals to be investigated understand us correctly when we talk of phenomena that can literally be *seen*. . . . We must therefore demonstrate to them exactly what it means to *see* something although no object is actually present" (p. 4). Personally, I must confess to my inability to *see* what Dr. Jaensch is trying to make children *see*. The danger of suggestion here is obviously great. The author must know what extravagant things are seen and done and said under the influence of suggestion, not forgetting our childhood friend—"the man in the moon."

On page 14 Dr. Jaensch outlines the laws that govern these phenomena. "The most conclusive proof that eidetic images are literally *seen* is that eidetic images are within wide limits subject to the same laws as sensations and perceptions. Our subject does not know anything about these laws and the fact that they are obeyed cannot be the result of suggestion." This statement, however, will scarcely get us over the initial difficulties of suggestion that are discernible on p. 4 of the same work.

Making for a practical application of his theories Dr. Jaensch speaks with great conviction. "Eidetic investigations have already shown that the closest resemblance to the mind of the child is not the mental structure of the logician, but of the artist. In fact, there are to be found among artists numerous personalities that permanently keep the characteristic of the youthful eidetic phase of development. For this reason it is advisable for educational purposes that the characteristic of youthful eidetic personalities, which are at the same time characteristic of many artists, should be preserved and taken into account." This is a serious claim for the theory of Dr. Jaensch, and even those who cannot boast eidetic or artistic temperaments will be interested by his book.

¹⁶ Jaensch, E. R.: *Eidetic Imagery*. Kegan Paul. 15s.

III. RECENT TRENDS OF THOUGHT IN GEOLOGY.

BY R. H. RASTALL, Sc.D., F.G.S.

In order to attain a philosophical standpoint from which to view modern trends in geological thought it is necessary to go back some considerable time. After the enlightened and strangely modern Italian geologists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there was a sad relapse into obscurantism in the eighteenth. Certain French workers, by field study of their own volcanic region in the Auvergne, reached results of much value, while the school of Werner at Freiberg, in Saxony, did excellent work in mining geology as a practical science, although their theoretical conclusions were largely absurd. But, on the whole, eighteenth century geology lost itself in a maze of cosmological speculation, without any basis of facts of observation, culminating in a great mass of vague and verbose "Theories of the Earth." Against all this there was naturally a reaction, and the science went to the other extreme—its sole end and aim for many years was the collection and recording of facts, and usually disconnected facts at that, while any attempt at a correlation of these facts on the basis of working hypotheses was frowned on by authority. Curiously enough with the coming of evolution in the middle of the nineteenth century the older ultra-protestant dogmatism, founded on a much too literal interpretation of the Biblical story of creation, was replaced by an equally dogmatic insistence on the infallibility of the ideas on physical and biological science then prevailing. However, modern physics and the philosophy founded thereon have also widened the ideas of geologists, and have let loose a flood of theoretical speculation which is even now in danger of going too far.

It is manifestly impossible in a short article to discuss all the directions in which the geological outlook has undergone changes in recent years, but a few leading points may be selected for special mention. On the economic side, in common with all other branches of industry, there is to be noted an extensive mechanization, but perhaps the most noticeable feature is the increasing use of scientific methods, and even the application of pure theory, to the prospecting for, and development of, deposits of valuable minerals and also to the search for coal, oil and water.

But it is in the realm of theoretical geology and the borderland between geology and cosmogony that the subjects of greatest general interest are to be found. Among these may be mentioned the origin and age of the Earth, the reasons for the past and present distribution of land and sea, and the building of mountain ranges. Although necessarily very brief and sketchy, it may be of some slight value if an attempt is here made to give a short review of the trend of recent thought on these subjects.

The origin of the Earth itself is naturally bound up with

that of the solar system. It appears that most geologists are inclined to accept, tentatively at any rate, the theory known as that of "grazing incidence," so ably set forth by Jeans and Eddington, for the origin of the planets. Put very briefly this theory assumes that at some far past time another star passed near enough to the sun to tear off, by gravitative attraction, a part of the material of the sun, at the same time imparting a spin to this material, which eventually rolled itself up into the planets and their moons, which then began to revolve in their orbits around the sun. The planets at first were hot and soft, and the moons probably split off from the planets while these were at any rate partially liquid, though perhaps having solid crusts.

From the geological point of view the date of the first formation of the solar system as such is not of much significance: the beginning of the field of geology proper must be regarded as the time when the Earth first attained a solid crust and something like rocks began to form. It is improbable that any of this first crust has survived, since it probably broke up and sank, perhaps several times over, till the underlying liquid became too cool and therefore too viscous to allow of any further subsidence. It should be noted that solid rock is heavier than molten rock, and therefore the analogy of ice floating on water does not hold. But actually the most recent developments of physical science do afford what is now believed to be a reliable means of determining the age of the oldest rocks accessible to us. It is impossible here, and probably superfluous, to discuss in detail the theory of the method. It must suffice to say that it depends on the application of the study of the radioactive disintegration of certain elements in the minerals composing the rocks. As is well known, uranium and thorium break up spontaneously, and after passing through many forms, including radium, eventually come to rest, so to speak, as lead. The rate of these changes, which is invariable, is known. Consequently, a determination of the ratio of uranium or thorium to lead in rocks gives a means of calculating their age. Hence, at last, we seem to be within sight of a reliable means of solving the ancient problem of the duration of geological time. It may be mentioned that most of the older methods, based on less trustworthy data, have given estimates that now appear to be much too low.

This argument, of course, depends entirely on the reliability of modern physical theory, and it must be admitted that the history of physical science in the last hundred years gives one cause to hesitate before accepting these results blindly as established beyond doubt: they are here given for what they are worth.

To descend from generalities to quantitative statements, it is calculated on the basis of radioactive theory that the oldest known rocks were formed about 1,500 million years ago; that the oldest fossils are about 500 million years old; the Coal

Measures of about half that age; while animals closely resembling some still living forms came into existence about fifty or sixty million years ago. By "animals" in the last sentence is meant certain rather lowly forms, sea-shells and corals and so on. The larger animals and especially the mammals of that distant age were not much like those now existing, and are more suggestive of the works of Lewis Carroll than of a modern Zoo. They are distinctly jabberwocky.

Geologists of the school of Lyell, from about 100 years ago onwards, taught that there had been a constant interchange of land and sea conditions almost everywhere. This idea, though true of certain regions, was by no means universally applicable. Geology began in western Europe and eastern North America, both of which are specially unstable regions, fringing great continents and liable to be flooded by shallow seas. When geology was extended to the interior of the great continents it was soon found that prevailing ideas had to be modified, and this reconsideration led eventually to the doctrine of the "permanence of ocean basins," which phrase, of course, implies equally the permanence of continental blocks. The case may perhaps be summed up in the statement that the middles of continents have never been under really deep sea, and that the floors of the deepest oceans have never been land.

Various objections have been raised to the strict application of this idea, especially by biologists: objections mainly based on the distribution of existing animals and plants. The same difficulty has arisen in respect of fossil forms, and therefore writers on both living and extinct forms have invoked violent geographical changes to account for their distribution, submerging whole continents or building "land bridges" across the great oceans to explain, for example, why the earthworms of the eastern United States are very like those of Europe. Most of the older geologists of the present day appear to cling to this notion, which involves very grave physical and mechanical difficulties that naturally do not appeal much to biologists.

Partly as a consequence of all this and partly for other reasons too long to set forth here, there has arisen a new and daring school of thought which supposes that the continents are not immoveably rooted in their present relative positions, but have behaved something like icebergs in the Polar Sea, drifting about slowly, very slowly, under the influence of currents or some other force in their substratum. It must be admitted that this seems a large order, but it will not do to dismiss it off-hand as impossible. It is quite certain at any rate that there is relative vertical displacement to some extent between continents and oceans, as shown by the existence of elevated shore-lines, as in Norway and South America: if vertical movement is possible, horizontal movement cannot be entirely ruled out.

This theory of continental drift, as it is commonly called, is mainly due to a German geographer and meteorologist, Alfred

Wegener, who unhappily lost his life lately in an expedition to Greenland, though a somewhat similar idea was suggested at an earlier date by an American named Taylor. The subject is complicated and difficult, and it is as yet too early to express a definite opinion on it. It may perhaps be said that the theory has found favour with many students of fossil plants, who find in it the easiest explanation of certain anomalous facts of distribution.

The third of the prominent geological problems previously mentioned, namely, the origin of mountain ranges, has been the subject of discussion for a very long time, and frankly it hardly seems to be any nearer to final solution. No allusion is here intended to volcanic mountains: there is now no controversy as to the origin of these, from the accumulation of lava and ash from the crater, though they were once regarded as swellings like gigantic bubbles on the Earth's crust. It is the origin of the great chains like the Alps and the Himalaya, built up of obviously crumpled and contorted sedimentary rocks, that is in question. The earliest and most obvious explanation was that these great lines of folding were due to the contraction of Earth's interior from cooling and the attempt of the solid outer crust, too large for its core, to settle down and adjust itself to the changed conditions. There are two objections to this theory: firstly, the localization of intense crumpling into narrow bands instead of a uniform distribution of small corrugations everywhere; and, secondly, from the recent developments of the study of radioactivity, it is by no means certain that the Earth is really cooling at all. Most of the alternative theories that have been put forward to explain mountain-building are so complicated and so technical that it is impossible to explain them briefly, and all seem to fail in some point or other. The general situation of the present moment may perhaps be summed up fairly as follows: whenever any suggestion based on observation of facts and geological considerations is put forward, nearly always some mathematician arises and says it is impossible. This applies to continental drift as well as to mountain-building, and it really appears as if our time is to be regarded as one when a suspension of judgment is advisable on these and many other cognate problems. The day of geological authority and orthodoxy is over, but the time has not yet arrived for a satisfactory synthesis of the facts into a coherent whole.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

THE POPE AND ITALY.

More cordial relations between the Holy See and the Italian State are indicated by recent enrolments in the three highest Pontifical Knighthoods known to the *Annuario Pontificio*. On January 2nd the Holy Father bestowed on His Majesty Vittorio Emanuele III, King of Italy, and on His Royal Highness Umberto di Savoia, Prince of Piedmont and Heir Apparent to the Throne of Italy, the Knighthood of the Supreme Order of Christ, a Military Order instituted by Pope John XXII in 1319. Signor Mussolini received the Order of the Golden Spur on January 6th; and on January 7th Count C. M. De Vecchi di Val Cismon and Signor Dino Grandi, Italian Ambassador to the Holy See and Foreign Minister respectively, received the Grand Cross of the Pian Order (A.A.S., XXIV, p. 61). More recently, on March 4th, the *Osservatore Romano* announced that His Majesty the King of Italy, through the Italian Ambassador to the Holy See, has conferred the decoration of the Supreme Order *della Santissima Annunziata* on the Secretary of State to His Holiness, Cardinal Pacelli. On the same occasion (March 3rd) the Knighthood of the Grand Cross of Saints Maurice and Lazarus was conferred on Mgr. Caccia Dominioni, Maestro di Camera, Mgr. Pizzardo, Secretary of the S.C. for Extraordinary Affairs, Mgr. Ottaviani, *Sostituto* of the Secretariate of State, Marchese Francesco Pacelli, Counsellor General of the Vatican State, and Father Tacchi Venturi, S.J.

Special significance attaches to the audience which Signor Mussolini had with the Holy Father on February 11th. It was the third anniversary of the signing of the Lateran Treaties, and the eve of the tenth anniversary of the Pope's coronation. The event aroused considerable popular enthusiasm, and altogether, in view of serious differences still quite recent, forms a happy close to a critical decade.

The attacks of Totalitarian statecraft upon Catholic Action are now, we may hope, past history. The first public protest, the Pope's Letter to Cardinal Schuster, was recorded in these notes last July. Since then, a full translation of the Encyclical *Non abbiamo bisogno* (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 285), in which the Holy Father appealed to the sense of the Catholic world, has been made available in pamphlet form ("Concerning Catholic Action," C.T.S.). It remains to add a note on the terms of the settlement, published in the *Osservatore Romano* for September 3rd, 1931. Essentially it comprised the following points: (1) a re-assertion of the non-political character of Catholic Action,

and the exclusion of officials hostile to the Régime; (2) an agreement not to set up specifically Catholic trade unions under "Catholic Action"; (3) an agreement (strange enough to English ideas) to exclude athletics and sport from the programme of organizations of Catholic youth; and to adopt the national flag for local associations to the exclusion of all other non-religious emblems. On these conditions the suppressed Associations have been restored.

Simultaneously the storm which raged round Article 43 of the Concordat has died down. Fortunately the marriage legislation has never provoked a similar controversy. By Article 34 the Sacrament of Matrimony is once more invested with full civil recognition, for which nothing more is required than transcription into the State registers at the request of the parish priest. The relevant section of Pius X's Catechism, prescribed for use in Rome on October 18th, 1912, has undergone revision, and new formulae for Questions 408-412 were approved by the S.C. of the Council on August 4th, 1931. The requirements for a Catholic marriage and for its civil effect are clearly stated. The Catholic is warned that anyone who ventures on a civil marriage either before or after the canonical marriage is regarded by the Church as a public sinner (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 337).

PROCESSES CONCERNING NULLITY OF ORDINATION.

When a case concerning the alleged nullity of a Sacred Ordination arises, it must be submitted to the S.C. of the Sacraments. The Holy See will, however, delegate the Ordinary on the spot to institute a preliminary enquiry, and subsequently, if sufficient evidence is forthcoming, to set up a formal judicial process. For the guidance of the local authority, complete regulations have now been issued by the S.C. They fill the thirty-six pages of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for December 5th, 1931; and are entitled "Rules to be observed in Processes concerning the Nullity of Sacred Ordination or of the obligations inherent in Sacred Orders." An introductory decree, bearing the date June 9th, 1931, points out that substantially the same rules were approved for matrimonial processes on April 27th, 1923. They are derived from the Constitution *Si datam*, promulgated by Benedict XIV, March 4th, 1748.

The Rules are drawn up in seventy-four paragraphs, spread over sixteen chapters, and further sub-divided like the canons of the Code. The chapters deal with the competent *forum*, the petition, the preliminary enquiry, the composition of a tribunal, the judge and his assistants, the opening of the process, the oaths and interrogatories, the examination of the petitioner, witnesses (ch. IX-XI), documents, circumstantial evidence and presumption, non-ratification by the subject, medical evidence, the closing of the process.

The last twenty pages are devoted to an Appendix containing

specimen forms for use at every stage of the process—by the petitioner, the Ordinary, the judge, the notary, etc. (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 457).

The Vatican Press also announces the publication of the complete text in a handier brochure of forty pages.

THE GUARANTEES REQUIRED BEFORE MIXED MARRIAGES.

The Church's solicitude to protect the faith of the Catholic party in a mixed marriage, and still more to protect the faith of the children of such a marriage, has led her to attach the greatest importance to the promises required before a dispensation is granted. In places, therefore, where the civil laws frustrate the fulfilment of these promises—promises demanded by the divine and natural law itself—it is not surprising that the Church withholds her dispensations. A fresh declaration on this subject has recently been issued by the Holy Office. The decree, dated January 14th, 1932, complains that the guarantees required before a marriage between a Catholic and a baptized or unbaptized non-Catholic are sometimes given in such a manner and form that their fulfilment cannot be urged with any effect in the face of contrary civil legislation, especially in the all-important matter of securing a Catholic education for the children, both boys and girls. In some places, the local authority or an heretical minister may even override the wishes of the parents.

Bishops, therefore, parish priests, and all who are empowered by canon 1044 to dispense from impediments *mixtae religionis* or *disparis cultus*, are warned by the S.C. that they must never grant such dispensation "unless the persons who intend to marry have previously given guarantees, the execution of which no one will be able to impede by invoking civil laws which affect either party, in their present or intended place of residence: otherwise the dispensation must be considered null and void" (A.A.S., XXIV, p. 25).

BOOK REVIEWS

The Franciscan Adventure. By Vida Dutton Scudder. (J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd. 15s.)

This book belongs to that category, grown very large in recent years, in which Franciscanism is commended chiefly in so far as it is misrepresented.

The author states in the Introduction (p. xiv): "But the art and letters, the science, the philosophy, and all the other activities which they (the sons of Francis) helped to develop, were with them subordinate to one great central matter: the right attitude of the Christian to private property."

That is not a true statement of the Franciscan movement and, moreover, the movement is not adequately explained throughout all the succeeding four hundred pages. The primary purpose of Saint Francis was religious, not social, nor cultural. He was concerned not so much with re-ordering the society of men, as with re-ordering the hearts of men. He was passionately orthodox. This the author indeed stresses later, but without appearing to understand the implications of her emphasis. Francis preached voluntary poverty as an evangelical counsel. During the conflict that began in the saint's lifetime, and continued with more intensity after his death, and in the series of reformations that have taken place within the Order, the point at issue always was how that counsel of perfection was to be carried out, or exactly how that vow of poverty was to be best observed in order to teach by example in the most effective way. The Church has always regarded private property as justified and necessary. She would never have countenanced the suggestion, nor was it at any time made within the Order, that the sublime ideal of Francis should be imposed throughout all society.

Though the author's gauge of the Franciscan movement is inaccurate (to say the least of the misapprehensions upon which the book is based), the work would not have been lacking in academic interest had a central, or general, thesis been sustained throughout. But the absence of such thesis is conspicuous and seriously detrimental to interest. The publishers state that the book "centres upon the conflict between the groups bent on literal obedience to Francis and complete renunciation of property, and the more moderate men, ready for compromise with practical necessities."

Conflict within the Franciscan Order was real, prolonged, intensely dramatic, frequently bitter, always vibrant with human interest. Even though viewed at the wrong slant, the story of that struggle would have been meaty reading. But the *conflict* is not kept uppermost in those pages; it is

perpetually submerged in the detail of narrative. The noise of battle rolls on behind a mountain of facts, dates, names, events flung up by the writer, so that the reader feels he is always running uphill, seeking with increasing weariness to discover where the struggle interlocks. And in the end he is reduced to asking, like *Ivanhoe*, from a pallet of exhaustion: "Rebecca, who yields now, and who advances?" The book was not constructed to bring into prominence that conflict with its great issues.

There seems promise of a general thesis in the Preface where the author says: "If there is still room for another work, it is because a full study of the social implications in Franciscan history in the light of contemporary thinking is still to seek."

But a study of the mediæval Catholic past yields no profit whatever if it be interpreted in terms of the Protestant present. From that fundamental error of reading history backwards, the author never disengages herself. Here is an instance of the false perspective that nullifies her work: "The Anglo-Saxon spirit of independence ran high then as now, and those brothers (the Franciscans in England) could not endure being managed from Assisi."¹

The author is sincere. If she misses the point of contact, it is not through shirking wide reading and honest study. One does not withhold sympathy from the motives that inspired this book and its painstaking execution. The reader will find himself frequently in agreement, as here for instance: "... the present relation between work and pay is not ideal. . . . It distracts attention from the real question—how to attain to the utmost the free and wholesome use of ability—to the irrelevant question, how much ability can earn in money: . . . Dante did not consider how much he was paid for the *Divine Comedy*. . . . Scrutiny of reward all but fatally inhibits creative power."

But when he arrives, in Appendix III, at the writer's summary of contemporary Franciscan experiments as exemplified by various American brotherhoods, by the religious leader, Bill Simpson, and by a group of ladies who have settled in "an old monastery long deserted on the slopes of the Apennines," and who call themselves "the Larks of St. Francis," then the reader's sympathy becomes sorrowful indeed.

Mention of Dante reminds us that he gets the usual wiggling for having put into Hell a Pope canonized by the Church. Let us be just to the poet. Assuming for the moment that the mysterious shade "who made the great refusal," and who is glimpsed in the vestibule to Hell, *is* Celestine V (but bear in mind that the identification can never be *certain*), these dates are of high importance: the ideal date assigned by Dante to his *Divina Commedia* is 1300. Scholarship has determined the real date of beginning the *Inferno* to have been about 1307-8,

¹ p. 94.

and the date of completion about 1313. Pope Clement V drew up the Bull of Celestine's canonization in this latter year. But, for various reasons, it happened that that decree was not published until the year 1328, that is to say, some seven years after the death of Dante. It was, therefore, not possible for the poet to have known the mind of the Church in regard to Celestine when he placed him, or if he placed him, in the *Inferno*.

We are fully in sympathy with the practice of anglicizing foreign names where possible without distortion or violence, in order that a too exotic atmosphere should not deter the general reader, yet we must confess to being disconcerted on hearing Jacopone da Todi introduced as "Big Jimmy," and Giovanni de Caulibus as "John of the Cabbages." Style hardly profits by this casual approach.

Finally, here are three extracts to enable readers to judge the pervading tone: "He (Francis) was not free from that shuddering dread of sex which marked the religion of his time."² ". . . an almost mechanical subservience to authority seems to the lay observer to mark monkish psychology."³ "The celibacy of the friars came to seem an unmixed evil to some critics of the Reformation. It may be taken as one reason for the lack of general social efficiency in the movement, and so one element in its defeat. Yet one must again recognize that the friars only shared the attitude of their period, which always confused celibacy with chastity, and made the former a Counsel of Perfection, considered as part of the Apostolic Commission, in disregard of the fact that Peter, and probably some of the other disciples, were married men. As one meets to-day sundry young clergymen, who cannot follow their call to unpopular action or complete renunciation because they have assumed family ties, one does feel that there is something to be said on behalf of the position."⁴

The Franciscan story is among the greatest, for the movement was steadied, shaped and balanced from within. It still works powerfully in the world to-day after that impulse given to it by its saint founder seven hundred years ago, and it has reaped a tremendous and shining harvest of good. But that great story is not told in this book.

ALICE CURTAYNE.

Consummata, by Raoul Plus, S.J. English Version by George Baker. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne. pp. 337+xii. 7s. 6d.)

It has been said that there are many "little flowers" secretly blooming in Carmel's "garden enclosed"; and that is probably true enough. Nevertheless, it is startling to find that in the

² p. 34.

³ p. 41.

⁴ p. 361.

last fifty years France has produced three such exquisite souls of distinctively Carmelite culture as St. Teresa of Lisieux, Sister Elizabeth of Dijon and the subject of the present notice.

Marie-Antoinette de Geuser (who styled herself variously Marie de la Trinité and Consummata) was born at Le Havre on April 20th, 1889. She died there on June 22nd, 1918. She never became a nun, but she was convinced that she had a Carmelite vocation, and was prevented from following it only by the protracted malady which resulted in her death. The utter renunciation of her own will, the complete surrender to the will of God, the love of truth, the liberty of spirit which she manifested, all have about them the authentic Carmelite ring. She was no self-conscious "victim," but she was a sacrifice of praise, "Hostia laudis."

An elder girl among a large family of brothers and cousins, she shared their games and their studies, taught the younger ones their Catechism and their Latin, encouraged the seniors in their humanities and theology, tended her sick mother and, in health, managed the home.

Her letters and spiritual notes show an acquaintance with theology and Sacred Scripture which is positively astounding in a girl of her years, and the precision and vividness of her writing are a delight.

Her mysticism is of the highest and most solid description. She is more akin to Elizabeth of the Trinity than to St. Teresa of Lisieux. St. Teresa was very far from being a sentimentalist, but there was a charm about her which has reduced many to sentimentalism; nobody could become sentimental about Marie-Antoinette. In her spirituality she is up on the peaks with St. John of the Cross, breathing the cold upper air and surrounded by a hard bright light. Her favourite subject of contemplation is the Trinity, though she is too good a daughter of St. Teresa to neglect the Incarnation and Passion of our Saviour. But you will find in her writings no indication of "a little way for little souls." Like another St. Paul, the saint of Lisieux "being crafty caught them by guile"—the ordinary souls little suspecting whither the little way would lead them. There is no such lure about *Consummata*. She is frankly eager for the giddy heights, a gallant figure who will inspire and attract generous souls who are avid of great sacrifice. Of course, there was no lack of humility about her (God's "little nobody"), any more than there was a lack of magnanimity about the little Carmelite who has won the heart of the world. But there appear a sternness and ruthlessness in her renunciation (despite her affection for family and friends) which when dwelt upon are almost terrifying, reminding one of the *Ascent of Mount Carmel*. Yet if you look back through these pages you will find little or nothing of the spectacular, nothing of fierce mortification, nothing very conspicuous in the life—except the whole of it! It is an excellent commentary on the Dark Nights and on Passive Purification, and nobody

who reads it will ever again confuse such energetic passivity with Quietism or anything remotely like it.

God instructs the world by His saints. St. Teresa of Lisieux re-opened the way of sanctification and contemplation to ordinary souls living in the world, and though we have many indications it is beyond human power to calculate the extent of the spiritual revival of which she has been the occasion in the modern world. Marie-Antoinette, living in the world but yearning for the cloister, checks the facile assumption that the strait way has been broadened or the narrow gate enlarged, the insidious inference that because retirement from the world and corporal austerities are not of the essence of sanctity, therefore, a primrose path has been substituted for the blood-stained way of the Cross.

Consummata has been happy in her biographer. Fr. Raoul Plus is a master of his craft. He allows his subject to speak for herself as much as possible, but is ever ready with a warning footnote to correct a false impression or to rescue her writing from possible misinterpretation. And he in his turn is happy in his translator, who has given us a piece of nervous English, sound and idiomatic from beginning to end.

T. E. FLYNN.

The Future of Capitalism. By Lewis Watt, S.J., B.Sc.(Econ.). (Catholic Social Guild. Oxford. pp. 72. 1s.)

In his first chapter the author gives a short and competent account of the development of our Industrial System during the last one hundred years; the purpose of this book is to make us alert and prepared, to divert the current of coming change into the safest channels. He rejects the Distributist's theories, as too drastic and impractical; his criticism is far from puncture-proof. To take only one small point, chosen, not as the weakest, but as refutable in the smallest space. Fr. Watt says that in the Peasant state, the standard of living is admittedly lower; this we emphatically deny. Standard of wages lower, yes! Standard of living, vociferously no! Even in England to-day, with Agriculture terribly depressed, the standard of living, in rural parts, is higher than in the industrial areas. Go to any country school or church, and look at the dress, deportment and physique of children and adults; go to almost any country cottage, for breakfast, dinner or tea, and so fortified, continue the pilgrimage to the homes of machine-tenders, and there too observe the quality of manhood, the clothing, food and home life. No further argument on this point will be necessary.

Speaking from some knowledge of the whole of the West of England, the standard of living, in the country—under most adverse conditions—is 20% better, and the standard of wages 20% lower than in the towns. France more closely approximates to the Peasant state. We have all met—and now try to avoid—the

man who has toured that country, and talks lyrically about the bounteous hospitality he received in forgotten little villages and isolated cottages. Observation establishes the vital fact. The reason for this apparent incongruity is another story, and a long one.

The author then analyses the Socialist's panacea, and sees no dawn of hope for the patient in that prescription. With the Chapter "Suggestions for Reform" we come to the kernel of the book. The Distributist and the Socialist hold that the Capitalist System as in vogue, is economically speaking, *per se malum*. We now come to that body of opinion, which maintains that Capitalism is, in spite of many defects, essentially sound. Father Watt takes the report of the Liberal Industrial Inquiry, as fairly representative of this school, and gives to it a detached approval—an approval in which the present writer cannot concur.

T. HOLDEN.

The Simplicity of Plainsong. By Justin Field, O.P. (J. Fischer and Bro., New York. 50 Cents.)

Well printed on good paper, giving a clear exposition of a thoroughly practical method, this book deserves special mention among the useful primers we already have. The author uses the Gregorian notation and follows the Solesmes rhythmic system, which continues to attract by its practicalness. Dealing with the elements of the Chant in brief, *The Simplicity of Plainsong* requires study, but it can be mastered in a few hours by any teacher with only a very limited knowledge of music. Part I gives a synopsis of the Course and Part II a Model Daily Lesson of anything from five to thirty minutes' duration, with copious notes and exercises. Tonic Sol-fa, clearly explained, is applied throughout, and if the Course is faithfully followed, pupils will soon learn to sing the Chant well and even attain some facility in sight-reading.

On p. 20 two virgas have been reversed by the printers. A remark may be permitted on one statement, although it has nothing to do with Plainsong. In the introduction it is said that at Low Mass the responses should be recited aloud by all the people present. The Sacred Congregation of Rites, while admitting its lawfulness, does not seem to look with favour on the practice on account of the inconveniences that may easily arise. (S.R.C., 4375, ad I. August, 1922.)

J. F. TURNER.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

THE MONTH for February gives us a thoughtful article on *The Faith our Victory* by Father Keating: "The chief obstacle to the conversion of the world to the Catholic Faith is not the opposition of its enemies but the unworthiness of those who already possess it." "That Note [of Holiness] is too commonly obscured by the failure of Catholics to put their faith into practice." "Reluctance to live by faith implies unwillingness to fulfil God's conditions for salvation and, in effect, to despise that salvation itself. The utter unreasonableness of this conduct is obvious: in relation to earthly concerns it would be branded as madness." Fr. Keating faces the problem presented by Catholics who throw away the pearl of great price, and the question whether a believer can lose the faith without blame. "Accordingly we can acquit of serious sin apostates from the faith, or at any rate can refrain from condemning them, only by supposing, as Professor Adam does, that their religious education had been 'wholly defective,' or that their state of rebellion was caused by some irresistible influence in some way evasive of grace. The former disability, as we implied at the start, is not very uncommon. Catholics on leaving the state of pupillage are not always conscious of their duty to discover how completely the claims of faith harmonize with reason, and on the other hand sometimes converts are received who have not understood the absolute surrender required by the 'obedience of faith.'" "Si scires donum Dei! The tragedy of our times is the spectacle of so many of our educated classes, endowed with an inheritance of such incomparable worth, which confers the freedom that springs from truth, the peace that goes with security, the strength that is based on certainty, possessing in their faith the one key to the mysteries of life and a guide and stimulus to the highest development of human nature, privileged, in a word, beyond millions of their fellows, yet feebly renouncing all that fair heritage at the first challenge of the Godless world, and becoming inevitably worse than those who lack this advantage." The whole article will repay careful reading.

THE CLERGY REVIEW is indebted to THE MONTH for February for a very appreciative estimate of its first year's work.

COLLECTANEA MECHLINIENSIA for March gives a second article by R. Kothen on *Les Toximanes*. The first article on Narcotic Drug-taking appeared in November, 1931, and was concerned with stupefying agents and their physiological action. Opium and its derivatives: morphia and heroine; cocaine; and hachish were given careful attention. The extent of the Narcotic drug producing and taking in various countries was duly set out.

In the recent number we have a study of the international struggle against stupefying drugs. The moral problem involved is then faced: the medical use and the extra-medical use made of them. There is a useful summary of the decisions of the Holy Office and of Propaganda. The article ends with an appeal for the co-operation of Catholics with the various organizations engaged in the struggle against opium and other narcotics.

THE CHRISTIAN DEMOCRAT for March (Catholic Social Guild. Oxford. 2s. 6d. a year) continues its *Notes on the Encyclical Quadragesimo Anno* and concludes Fr. Watts' *The Call to Social Study*. There is a particularly interesting account of the life of the German Chancellor *Heinrich Brüning*.

Professor R. Draguet of Louvain who wrote in October, 1930, a devastating study of Eisler's "The King who did not reign" for the REVUE D'HISTOIRE ECCLESIASTIQUE, has set out in simpler form the substance of his scholarly work in an article: *Le Joseph slave et les origines chrétiennes* in the March number of COLLATIONES DIOECESIS TORNACENSIS. The same number treats of the very serious problem of *Mariage et santé*, and in a further article states the principles and the conclusions *De solutione Catholica problematis Eugenismi*.

Monsieur Louis Bertrand began in the second number for January of the REVUE DES DEUX MONDES a very important series of studies on *L'Espagne Musulmane*. There are few historians who know their Spain better than M. Bertrand, and few are more familiar with Mahometanism. He is well aware of the age-long anti-Spanish prejudices grounded in political and religious ideas which have prevailed in countries outside Spain. One of the outstanding weaknesses of foreign writers on Spanish History is that of neglecting to correlate the facts of the history of Spain with European history contemporary with those facts. A favourite form of caricature of Spanish History has been a ridiculous over-estimation of the civilization of the Moors of Spain to the depreciation of Spanish Catholicism. M. Bertrand sets out to remove this injustice. He points out that the Moors inherited in Spain the substance of Roman Civilization as it had survived the Germanic invasions and the attempted Visigothic restoration. The Moorish conquerors only followed in the footsteps of their predecessors. They found suitable houses, well adapted to the climate, cities planned by the military genius of Rome, adorned as their historians testify, with magnificent monuments, with fortified enclosures, roads, bridges, aqueducts, which they only had to keep in repair.

They found the land admirably cultivated by the Andalusian peasants—but the carelessness they showed in North Africa and in Byzantine lands was repeated in Spain: the soil became less fertile, the irrigation works less effective, and it is from the Moorish Conquest that the appalling famines date. Arab historians tell us of the first Andalusian migration into Morocco in 749, occasioned by a famine which lasted for five years. In the course of the ninth century there were no less than five

long periods of famine—a fact somewhat surprising to those who have read modern dithyrambic eulogies of the Spain so admirably administered by the Moors. After all, the only thing they had to do was to make use of an already fertile and prosperous land. But in making use of what was to hand they had the advantage of the ability of the true Sons of the Soil who drew their inspiration from the old Hispano-Roman civilization around them. It will be seen, at once, what an important piece of work the French Academician has taken in hand, and what light it will shed on the true history of Spain.

A special word of welcome should be offered to LITURGICAL ARTS, a Quarterly devoted to the Arts of the Catholic Church, which made its first appearance in the autumn of last year. The editorial states the policy of the new periodical which is "to publish material falling into six major divisions." These are (1) The relation of the arts to the worship of the Church. (2) The history of Catholic art. (3) Practical articles on the liturgical requirements governing the construction and decoration of Churches. (4) Descriptions of the best modern work. (5) Notes on rare objects of art in museums or in the sales' catalogues. (6) Bibliographies of publications in the field of Christian art. The first number excellently fulfils these purposes. Abbot Herwegen, O.S.B., writes on "The Nature of the Religious Art"; C. R. Morey discusses "The Genesis of Christian Art"; The Church of St. Vincent Ferrer, New York, is described with the help of excellent photographs by Oliver Reagan. "The Liturgical Construction of the Altar" (with a number of diagrams in colour) is the subject of a useful article by the Rev. Edwin Ryan, D.D. "A modern way of the Cross in mosaic" is discussed by Hildreth Meiere. The magazine is published quarterly by the Liturgical Arts Society, Ltd., 368, Fourth Avenue, New York City, at the reasonable price of 50 cents a copy or \$2 a year for the four numbers. It should make a special appeal to Catholic architects, artists, builders, and designers of Churches and Church furniture.

CORRESPONDENCE

EVOLUTION AND THEOLOGY.

From Dr. P. G. M. Rhodes.

In reply to Dr. Messenger :

I agree with Dr. Messenger that it is most unlikely that in I, 91, 2 St. Thomas was absentmindedly teaching the doctrine of plurality of souls. But I do not think that the phrases quoted from the first part of the article are intended to apply primarily to the human soul. I take it that the argument is this: the human *body* must have been formed either by the Platonic thought-forms, or by the angels, *adhibitis seminibus quibusdam*, or by God. St. Thomas refutes the first view by repeating what he had already said (q. 65, 4) that pure forms cannot produce a compositum. The argument is taken from Aristotle and is quite general, without special reference to the human soul, with which he had dealt in q. 90. The special nature of the soul does not affect the conclusion, and St. Thomas does not complicate his argument by reintroducing all these distinctions. The second view is rejected as there was in existence no human body that the angels might use. I do not think that the Angelic Doctor can be fairly accused of a careless use of terms.

In reply to Dr. Whitfield :

Perhaps I should have said that the older writers thought of a progress, on the whole continuous, from imperfect to more perfect forms. It was, of course, well known that cases occurred, affecting certain genera or even families, in which degradation had taken place owing to some change in the food supply or to the adoption of a parasitic habit. But it is only during the last few years that sweeping suggestions have been made that degeneration in the form of simplification or "juvenescence" is almost universal in whole classes or sub-classes of plants. I refer to the theories of Church concerning the lichens and of Corner concerning the ascomycetes.

Of course, there is no reason why a certain mutation should not occur independently several times, but it would amount to a miracle of coincidence that it should have happened to Adam and Eve just at the right moment. I do not think that the modern non-Catholic biologist would admit for a moment the practical possibility of the idea; one could only placate him by denying all interposition of miracle, and mating the first man to a sub-human Eve.

Fr. Whitfield overlooks one difference between Vries' Evening Primroses and Adam. The former were bisexual, the latter not.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100